THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XII.—OCTOBER, 1887.—No. 48.

HAS PROFESSOR HUXLEY'S MISSION BEEN A FAILURE?

THE closing words of Professor Huxley's article in a recent number of the *Nineteenth Century* must have been a source of pain to his many admirers. The renowned scientist says:

"My career is at an end. . . . .

'I have warmed both hands at the fire of life,'

and nothing is left me before I depart but to help, or, at any rate, to abstain from hindering, the younger generation of men of science in doing better service to the cause we have at heart than I have been able to render."

These be sad words, indeed; and, even though Mr. Huxley may not have intended them as his valedictory to literature, it is quite evident that the learned professor regards them as final and leavetaking in the pursuits of science—at least in the sense that he has abandoned all hope of rendering further or better service to the cause he has so much at heart.

There are few sights more saddening than the failure of a career of great promise. Few men have ever pledged themselves to the achievement of greater results than Mr. Huxley; and hence the sadness of his leavetaking is deepened by the still more melancholy sadness which rings out with such pathos in his tones of conscious failure. Were Professor Huxley a modest man, his

readers might feel inclined to believe that, in handing over the cause he has at heart to men of a younger generation, he had couched his testament in such terms as to conceal the superiority of his overshadowing merits. But modesty is not, in his opinion, one of the cardinal virtues. From his attitude towards it, it would be quite just to conclude that he regards it as the deadliest of sins. And no one who is at all acquainted with his writings would for a moment hesitate to say that Professor Huxley would be the last man living to depreciate his own merits. But his own views, as to his success or failure, important though they be, are in reality of little moment. The great scientist's noble aim and its success are before the world, and open to debate.

For over a quarter of a century Professor Huxley has been a prominent figure in the scientific world. But he has been something more than a scientist, pure and simple. He has been the Hercules of modern thought, and the stern and implacable foe of "orthodoxy." On the plains of science, indeed, his tents were pitched, and biology and physiology were his favorite pastimes; but as he sat by the door of his tent his wary eyes traveled around the whole world of thought, over which he exercised an ever-wakeful vigilance. Seldom, indeed, has a half-hour's perusal of Professor Huxley's writings failed to recall to our mind the description of the scene in the valley of Terebinth: and the mighty Goliath of Geth, with his helmet of brass and his coat of mail with scales; with his greaves and his buckler, and the staff of his spear like a weaver's beam, seemed hardly less formidable than the redoubtable "man of science." Even the language of both sounded strangely alike in tone, in message, in challenge, in menace. It was difficult to suppress a shudder as he significantly pointed to the vanquished superstitions and "extinguished theologians" which he told you lie around the cradle of every science, or as he waxed wroth over the evils of "orthodoxy" or the wickedness of "ultramontane Catholicism." Even the horrors of the guillotine were made to pass before your eyes; for Professor Huxley would tell you to-day that "orthodoxy was the Bourbon of the world of thought," and significantly remind you to-morrow that he and the leaders of scientific thought were the Carnots who organize victory for truth. What wonder that orthodoxy should be in mortal terror! What wonder that "ultramontane Catholicism" should have clung to the giant's knees and begged for quarter! Such was the impression of himself which Professor Huxley thought his writings imprinted on the minds of the reader; and the task which he undertook was worthy of the courage and ability of him who undertook it. That task was nothing more or less than the utter demolition of Christianity—"to throw down the triumphant fal-

lacy;" "to lend a helping hand to Providence, to knock this imposture on the head;" "to remove Christianity, this incubus of the philosophers;" to make fossil "dogmas that ought to be fossil but are not;" to guillotine "the Bourbon of the world of thought." These were the labors which, with a glow of enthusiasm, he told you were "meet for the strength and the courage of the Hercules of mitigated scepticism." These were the lofty and praiseworthy aims which Professor Huxley proposed to himself as the reward of his scientific labors, the crowning effort of his career. And to Professor Huxley, orthodoxy in its most odious form was synonymous with the Catholic Church. For, after all, it was dogmatic Christianity, as embodied in Catholicity, which was the central point of his hatred. Protestantism was not worthy of his anger. "Ultramontane Catholicism" it was which "was antagonistic to the very essence of science." To strip the Church of her preposterous pretensions, to unmask the hollow superstition, to tear away the veil from the face of a gigantic hypocrisy, to level to its foundation a false and festering civilization based upon Christian dogma, and establish upon its ruins a pure, healthful, scientific constitution; to withdraw from this myth and Moloch of Christian superstition the love, the homage, the veneration, the mysterious and hallowed awe and affection which cling to it, and instead to persuade the nations of the earth to worship at the temple of science and bend in homage before her altars, where Professor Huxley was sovereign pontiff and infallible guide,—this was the lofty and sacred task to which he devoted his energies, dedicated his studies and consecrated his life. If he made no secret of his purpose, he had little doubt of his success. He began his work much as Solomon began his reign, full of high hopes and pious intentions. And even quite late in his career,—now, alas! at an end,—his hopes of success seemed to run high, nay, even to reach their flood-tide. To show that the sanguine hopes of Professor Huxley have not been overstated, or his mission overrated, we will let the philosopher speak for himself. In his first article on the "Origin of Species" he told the world:

"The myths of Paganism are as dead as Osiris or Zeus, and the man who should revive them in opposition to the knowledge of our time would be justly laughed to scorn. *But the coeval imaginations current among the rude inhabitants of Palestine, recorded by writers whose very names and age are admitted by every scholar to be unknown, have unfortunately not yet shared the same fate. . . . . In this nineteenth century*, as at the dawn of modern physical science, *the cosmogony of the semi-barbarous Hebrew is the incubus of the philosopher* and the opprobrium of the orthodox. . . . . And history records that whenever science and orthodoxy have been fairly opposed, the latter has been forced to retire from the lists, *bleeding and crushed, if not annihilated; scotched, if not slain. But orthodoxy is the Bourbon of the world of thought.* It learns not, neither can it forget."

In 1869, at an after-dinner speech in the city of Liverpool, when the soul of the man of science, softened, presumably, by the good cheer, was clement even to his hated adversaries, in comparing "the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church" with "the comfortable champions of Anglicanism and Dissent," and with the balance of compliment in favor of the former, he spoke of Catholicity as

"our great antagonist—I speak as a man of science—the Roman Catholic Church, the one great spiritual organization which is able to resist, and which must as a matter of life and death resist, the progress of science and modern civilization."

In his inaugural address as Lord Rector of the University of Aberdeen, in 1874, he is even more explicit:

"The act," he tells his hearers, "which commenced with the Protestant Reformation is nearly played out, and a wider and a deeper change than that effected three centuries ago—a reformation, or rather a revolution, of thought, the extremes of which are represented by the intellectual heirs of John of Leyden and Ignatius of Loyola, rather than by those of Luther and Leo—is waiting to come on. . . . . Change is in the air. . . . . It insists on reopening all questions, *and asking all institutions, however venerable, by what right they exist.*"

In his address on Joseph Priestley, at Birmingham, in the same year, he is seized with the same aggressive spirit, and significantly tells his audience, concerning such men as Joseph Priestley and himself:

"There are men to whom the satisfaction of *throwing down a triumphant fallacy* is as great as that which attends the discovery of a new truth; *who feel better satisfied with the government of the world when they have been helping Providence by knocking an imposture on the head.* . . . . . These men *are the Carnots who organize victory* for truth, and they are at least as important as the generals who visibly fight her battles in the field."

Professor Huxley is, however, not satisfied with simply organizing victory in the cabinet or council. In his "Life of Hume," he seems to think the hour for decisive action has come, and, with a zeal that is contagious and an enthusiasm that is inspiring, he proclaims that time has struck the hour when he should step boldly and defiantly into the arena, and take up the cause, languishing since the death of David Hume. Of all the warriors who fought nobly against superstition, the warfare and weapons of David Hume are the most acceptable to the soul of Prof. Huxley. If Hume be the Achilles of the long siege, Mr. Huxley is at least the Telamonian Ajax, and although he is accredited heir to the arms of the departed Achilles, the ardor of his spirit is by no means satisfied until he forges new weapons before which many a Christian Hector will fall back in despair. His pen records in glowing terms the prowess of the brave warrior. His heart swells with noble admiration as he gazes upon the figure of Hume intrenching himself

upon the impregnable fortress of the *Pyrrhonian doubt.* His soul is fired with a noble emulation and is kindled into confidence, courage and enthusiasm by turns, until the spirit of his daring at last outstrips even the advances of the great "protagonist of agnosticism," and his zeal impels him to say:

"But, further, it is the business of criticism not only to keep watch over the vagaries of philosophy, but to do the duty of police in the whole world of thought. *Wherever it espies sophistry and superstition, they are to be bidden to stand; nay, they are to be followed to their very dens and there apprehended and exterminated, as Othello smothered Desdemona 'else she'll betray more men.'*"

With an ineffable admiration which in a man of his powers it is charming to behold, he exultingly quotes these words of Hume against superstition and religion, in them outlining his war policy:

"'Chased from the open country, these robbers fly into the forest and lie in wait to break in upon every unguarded avenue of the mind and overwhelm it with religious fears and prejudices. The stoutest antagonist, if he remits his watch a moment, is oppressed; and many, through cowardice and folly, open the gates to the enemies, and willingly receive them with reverence as their legal sovereigns.

"'But is this a reason why philosophers should desist from such [metaphysical] researches, and leave superstition still in possession of her retreat? Is it not proper to draw an opposite conclusion, and perceive the necessity of carrying the war into the most secret recesses of the enemy?'" etc., etc.

And Mr. Huxley follows up the quotation with this enthusiastic comment:

"Near a century and a half has elapsed since *these brave words were shaped by David Hume's pen;* and the business of carrying *the war into the enemy's camp* has gone on but slowly. Like other campaigns, it long languished for want of a good base of operations." [Rather a *naïve* admission!] "But," he adds (with that exquisite refinement of sentiment, and gentlemanly grace and elegance of language of which Professor Huxley is, betimes, so easily a master), "since *physical science, in the course of the last fifty years, has brought to the front an inexhaustible supply of heavy artillery of a new pattern, warranted to drive solid bolts of fact through the thickest skulls, things are looking better;* though hardly more than the first faint flutterings of the dawn of the happy day *when superstition and false metaphysics shall be no more* and reasonable folks may live at ease, are as yet discernible by the *enfants perdus* of the outposts."

In these and similar words did Professor Huxley record his hopes and forecast the results of his mission, the importance of which, but for his own testimony, which we have given freely, we might be suspected of exaggerating. His career is at an end, as he says, and inquiry about its results can hardly be considered premature. Quite naturally we look for immense results from such magnificent promises. We expected to see the field of Revelation strewn with "apprehended" sophistries and "exterminated" superstitions.

Has Professor Huxley redeemed his word or fulfilled his

promise? How many superstitions or sophistries has science strangled in their very dens? What particular dogmas of Christianity have been bidden to halt? Indeed, it is to be feared that the "skulls" of orthodoxy are even thicker than Professor Huxley has made allowance for, since we are acquainted with many that are yet uncracked. Mr. Huxley should have great results to show at the close of his career after such outspoken promises. We shall see how great they are. He has vigorously and resolutely applied himself to his chosen work and invoked the help of all agnostics and all physical science. He girds on his good sword for the mighty work which he has sworn to prosecute, and summons laboratories to his aid. With unanimous accord scientists are resolved that one last, united, desperate effort must be made to sweep the superstition of Christianity from the face of the world, at once and forever. To this end all forces must join. For this object all powers must strive. Every field of science is explored, every region of thought is drained of its supplies, every form of philosophy is laid under contribution to furnish the resources for the accomplishment of this mighty work. All the intellectual wealth of the past and present must be poured into one common treasury to furnish the means to carry on the work to a successful completion: Embryology with its hardenings and section-makings; biology with its protoplasmic investigations and recorded observations; physiology and anatomy with their modifications and differentiations; geology with its fauna and flora; paleontology with its lacustrine and fluviatile beds, its trilobites, megalosauri and cephalopods; astronomy with its nebulæ, its meteors, and interstellar spaces—all must unite in one gigantic conspiracy for the overthrow of the Christian religion. To descend from the barbarous jargon of scientific nomenclature, Professor Huxley and his colleagues have anxiously searched the heavens above and the earth beneath, and the waters that are under the earth; they have scrutinized every branch of science; they have examined closely every department of knowledge; they have brought together the most antagonistic philosophies; they have rehabilitated the defunct religions of barbarous and extinct tribes; they have summoned to their aid the atheism and infidelity of the eighteenth century; they plant their standard on the scientific discoveries and inventions of the last fifty years, and march forward in the name of scientific truth, in all the pomp and magnificence of our nineteenth century enlightenment, moving with measured and majestic tread, terrible as an army in battle array. The superstition is to be dethroned; the hideous deformity is to be unmasked.

But at the very moment we look for the onslaught, suddenly a change comes over the scene. The army, rushing on to what it

believes to be certain victory, in the very moment of expected attack, is suddenly called to a halt, an apparent flag of truce is raised in the ranks of the threatening legions—"a banner with a strange device," the three simple words: "*I don't know!*" which in this instance carry the strangest meaning, namely, that in these words we are to look for the full measure and extent, the length and breadth and height and depth of the real power of all concentrated and combined forces of that formidable array. It is the concentrated essence of all the forces of scientific infidelity against religion.

Not a single sophistry apprehended, not a single superstition bidden to halt! The puerile tactics of feeble dialectics in opposition to the Church have often been amusing enough, but it was reserved for science in the nineteenth century, in the full pride and plentitude of its glory, to choose an argument which sophistry would scorn. Science hiding its head beneath the invincible strength of the argument, "*I don't know*," is an absurdity which discounts all the inventions of fiction. Indeed, taken in connection with the pompous manifesto of Prof. Huxley already quoted, there can be no more candid confession of the utter impotency of science against Christianity. It is the frank avowal that not science, not criticism, not infidelity, not scepticism, not atheism, nor all of them combined have been able to invent a single argument against even a single dogma of Christianity.

And this, then, is the outcome of all our nineteenth century wisdom, philosophy and science. This is the result of that warfare waged by means of the "heavy artillery of a new pattern" scientifically "warranted to drive solid bolts of fact into the thickest skulls." This is all our self-appointed "police in the world of thought" have to show after patrolling round and round in search of sophistry and superstition.

The agnosticism of Professor Huxley is, then, an avowed failure as an argument against Christianity and as a philosophical invention—as a camping ground for scientists who affect a *penchant* for philosophy, the position is in the highest degree ludicrous. We might smile at the simpering simpleton who to every question put him stupidly answers: "*I don't know*"; but we would be apt to lose patience if, when we turned away, he winked and snivelled and made strange grimaces, and dogmatically asserted and denied as though endowed with the attribute of omniscience. But patience would be apt to reach the limit of endurance if, on pursuing our honest inquiries elsewhere, he followed close at our heels, keeping up a senseless babble and clatter because we would not insist upon asking of him the knowledge which he declared himself unable through ignorance to give. We ask Professor Huxley: "Has science dis-

proved Christianity?" "Yes." "In what points?" "I don't know!" "Does the soul live after death?" "I don't know." "Has man a soul at all?" "I don't know." "Is evolution a true theory?" "Yes." "What are the proofs?" "I don't know." "Is there a heaven or a hell?" "I don't know." These things are unintelligible. "What has science really proved against Christianity?" "I don't know." Christianity is unintelligible. And so on through all the questions which lie near men's souls, and which give a meaning to life, agnosticism has the simple answer, *I don't know.* It doubts. It shakes its head with a sorrowful smile. And Professor Huxley mournfully tells the world: "The problem of ultimate existence seems to be hopelessly beyond the reach of my poor powers." In the catechism of agnosticism the only answer to any question of importance is, *I don't know.* People cease to wonder as they hear Carlyle in characteristic comment bluntly muttering: "Wonderful as indicating the capricious stupidity of mankind." The monotonous drivel might pass muster as the musings of dotage or a song of poor Poll; but that science should deliberately adopt it as a cognomen, make it the last word of knowledge on subjects of most solemn import, and for whose solution scientists themselves are most anxiously looking—that its invention should be regarded as the acme of intellectual greatness, that it should be accepted as the end of hypothesis and fact, physics and metaphysics, invention and discovery, analogy and syllogism, all the irrefragable arguments of philosophy and all the experiments of laboratories, together with what Professor Huxley himself would call the weary clatter of an endless logomachy, at first sight seems hardly credible. And all this in the nineteenth century! And all this in the name of science! And all this by men aspiring to intellectual leadership in the world of thought! And above all by Professor Huxley, who all but styles himself "the Hercules of mitigated scepticism." It is indeed an age of paradox, and the Elysian fields of science seem to be its paradise. Ignorance has often before been made a matter of boast and set up as a platform from which to rail at knowledge; but the apotheosis of ignorance has awaited the age of science, when, with beat of drum and blare of trumpet, with much show of many words and great pomp of ceremony, it should be raised triumphantly to its proper place. This was the first and most potent of all the pieces of Professor Huxley's "heavy artillery of a new pattern warranted to drive solid bolts into the thickest skulls"; and its position, which was its strength, has been discovered to be rather an unsafe and ignominious one. Evidently the grand first principle of agnosticism, *I don't know*, was originally designed as a battering ram of tremendous crushing force and power, but, being found ineffectual, it has been retired to serve as a stalking-horse under

cover of which the light infantry might maintain a fire of shot and musket ball upon the enemy. Or, to use the phrase of Touchstone, it was mistakenly invented as the "lie direct" to Christianity, but, failing in that, it has fallen back to the rank of the "quip modest." The agnosticism under which Professor Huxley hides himself is about as destructive to Christianity as is the sand in which the ostrich hides his head to the pursuer.

Professor Huxley's arsenal possessed just two other weapons. One was a theory deduced from scientific observations, or, to speak more correctly, a hypothesis in corroboration of which the facts of science were adroitly manipulated. The other was forged from the true Damascus steel of pure science. The former was the Darwinian hypothesis of evolution against Christianity in general. The latter was the geological record against the Genesiac cosmogony. Far from the writer of this article be the worse than summer madness of presuming to contend with the vast and varied wisdom of Professor Huxley; and more especially to dare to measure swords with him on grounds so exclusively, nay, even jealously, his own. Ours, here, is the far more humble task of one who, during the last decade of years, has listened at a distance to the loud reverberating echoes of Mr. Huxley's "heavy artillery of a new pattern" as under his leadership it thundered pitilessly upon its victims, and who now, upon the announcement that the campaign is ended, has a curiosity to review the field, number the "annihilated and slain," and, as a warning lesson, mayhap, to gaze upon the gaping wounds of the "crushed and bleeding," or turn with a shudder from the hideous appearance of the "scotched" victims.

But upon examination Mr. Huxley's fire, here too, seems to have proved ineffectual. And what is more, the choice of weapons seems to have been again a mistaken one. Indeed, it is highly probable that within due limitations the doctrine of evolution would be not only acceptable, but highly useful, to the Church. It would solve many difficulties and shed light upon obscurities which at present are perplexing to Biblical exegetes; and it is worthy of remark that it is only in this friendly sense that the theory of evolution is ever likely to become an accepted conclusion either in science or philosophy. The doctrine of a Divine Providence would hardly be looked upon as novel by theologians, and the sustained *act of creation* which prevails "even till now," by which the universe is conserved, and without which it would revert to its original chaos, does not sound strange to the ears of orthodoxy. And yet between these "fossils" of theologians and the promised evolution there seems to exist a close relation and kinship which endows the former with a new beauty, and gives a promise that Professor Huxley's lion, when properly tamed and subdued, will lie

down gently and peacefully with the lamb of theology. This is probably what Mr. Gladstone means when he tells Mr. Huxley that he feels only too much biassed in favor of evolution by what he conceives "to be its relation to the great argument of design." But for the theory of evolution, even in a much modified sense, the proofs seem to be singularly hesitant and faltering; and, while theology will welcome as an ally the demonstration when it comes, at present it feels compelled to play the agnostic doubter to the science of the agnostics and "suspend judgment" until science furnish proofs which will compel assent; or, to use Mr. Huxley's elegant phrases, until its "thick skulls" have been "pierced" by the "bolts" of scientific fact. But while the demonstration of modified evolution is singularly tardy, the evidence in favor of the Darwinian hypothesis (which is the theory so strenuously advocated by Prof. Huxley) would seem to break down altogether. Mr. Gladstone would seem to be justified when he says of those who are committed to the theory that "their pace and method seem rather too much like a steeple-chase." In the vast chaos of this hypothesis, deep yet lies under deep, and abyss calls to abyss. The unspanned chasm yawning between inorganic matter and living matter will, it seems, ever remain unbridged. "Spontaneous generation" was a delusion long fondly cherished by scientists as a cable which could with safety be flung across the great gulf; but one of the greatest services of M. Pasteur was to rid the world of this piece of scientific quackery. It is one of the exploded myths of science which takes its place with the anthropoidal ape supposed to connect *homo sapiens* with the animal world. Around these two mysteries scientific dogma fondly clusters, and while reviling religious faith, demands an unbounded, implicit and unfounded faith in these things neither seen nor proved.

The world had heard so much about the gospel of evolution, the wonder of its workings, the unity of its scope, the grandeur of its results; how it was to rise and triumph by its own inherent power as oil rises to the top of the water, as the kite rises against the wind, or as Christianity arose above paganism by the force and efficacy of its own intrinsic worth, that it was not surprising if mankind yielded to a natural curiosity to examine, and now experiences a feeling of disappointment.

It was to be a ringing out of the old as well as a ringing in of the new. There was a flourish of trumpets, a rush as of a mighty wind. The old sovereign was to be dethroned and degraded before the eyes of all mankind. The world was invited to come and sit by the windows of the laboratory, and watch the system by which the new heavens and the new earth were evolved; how a fossil oyster overthrew the idea of creation, and rendered it effete and im-

possible; how the superfluous teeth of the fœtal Balæna destroyed all belief in God's Providence, how the habits of plants and lower animals showed the story of man's fall to be a myth of a superstitious age. The dry bones of the plesiosaurus, the chalks of the tertiary period, the trilobite, belemnite, and even fossil horses that gloried in five toes, were arrayed in conclusive evidence against it. The dry bones of countless ages were decked in all the glory and grandeur of our modern arts and inventions, they were tricked out in all the tinsel of a lustrous sophistry and galvanized into new life until they wriggled in menacing attitudes, ominous to religion and death-dealing to superstition. The grotesque picture was a fitting companion to that which Carlyle has so vividly sketched for us of Maximilien Robespierre "in his new nankeen trousers, with bouquet in hand, in front of the Tuileries pronouncing the scraggiest of prophetic discourses on the *Etre Supreme* and setting fire to much emblematic paste-board." And wo to the world if it tittered at the reasoning, or if an incredulous smile was detected on the countenance, for Professor Huxley and some of his colleagues possessed the art of showing the world that even if their science was imperfect and their logic defective, they could amply atone for these shortcomings by deftly and dexterously handling the weapons of sarcasm, and could prove themselves to be perfect masters in the logic of ridicule. To dissent from their conclusions was to proclaim yourself an enemy of progress and a victim of superstition. To doubt the value of their hypothesis was to demonstrate your incapacity for the science of the laboratory. To speak disparagingly of fossil molluscs or crustacea of the Middle Cambrian or Upper Silurian epoch showed distinctly that you belonged to the class from which the "circle-squarers, perpetual-motioners and flat-earth men are recruited." To convince them of sophistry was "to revel in the luxury of unqualified assurance." If Professor Huxley could not prove that you were "wrong, but only that you were absurd," the awful chastisement which the "man of science" dealt out to you was "to let you alone"—unless, sometimes, indeed, impelled by unusual provocation, in a moment of infinite disgust Professor Huxley was constrained to summarily consign all obstinate orthodoxy "to the fauna and flora of a past age."

However, the old was not yet rung out nor the new yet rung in. The world comes to Professor Huxley and congratulates him on his success in filling up the gaps in the geological record, and to inquire how it fares with the new god of science. It comes with the best of intentions, in the best of faith, nothing doubting, to behold the miracle of the nineteenth century, the statue unveiled, the thing of beauty arisen out of the earth as Venus rose from the

sea. It asks to behold the grand tree of evolution, this spinal column running through all nature, connecting the loftiest intellect with the lowest form of matter, this noble Igdrasil of the ancient Scandinavian, with its roots in the earth, its trunk heaven-high, and its branches covering the whole earth; this new discovery of "matter through all her special forms ascending." It expresses a desire to see the transitions, the forms, the various stages and processes, the links that have been lost and found again, and is somewhat surprised to find that the voice which was bold and defiant on the housetop becomes weak and diffident in the laboratory; that faltering hesitancy, vacillating language, and uncertain results meet it when the inquiry comes to particulars.

The scientific harangues derided religion for its faith and credulity. Miracle and mystery and dogma and doctrine formed the constant themes of endless revilings. Over such abominations every orator grew eloquent, and every scientist became an orator. What was, then, the amazement of the world when it beheld the scientist, with the ruddy glow of his eloquence and indignation yet mantling his cheek, turn to his own god to lavish upon it in unlimited measure that faith which had just been the object of his eloquent abhorrence? It is only religious faith that is deserving of censure, it would appear; and scientific faith is deserving of all praise. And the beliefs of science are founded, not on the strength of reason or revelation, but on the slender grounds of mere conjecture. Demands unlimited are made upon our credulity at every step. Indeed, it will hardly be denied that the most extravagant of religious creeds has hardly taxed the faith of men to the extent that science tests their powers of belief. A Brahminical creed of Hindoo mysteries and superstitions would not draw upon our credibility more than the creed of evolution. What could be, what might be, what would be, under certain hypothetical conditions; what, in the opinion of the "man of science," should be and ought to be, are the dogmas of speculative science. It has tried to rid the world of supernatural mysteries and religious faith, but it has amply compensated for this by supplying us with a full measure of natural mysteries which science does not solve; and we are asked to accept them, not on Divine authority, or on the authority of human reason, or on the demonstrations of science, but on the mere conjecture and hap-hazard hypothesis of the "man of science." Indeed, the wealth of faith which science lavishes on its conceits and groundless assumptions would justify a Catholic in maintaining every episode in the *Divine Comedy* as an article of faith, or the devout Puritan in maintaining the stages in the "Pilgrim's Progress," through which Christian passes from the City of Destruction to the Celestial City, as actual physical existences.

The Darwinian hypothesis has been, as it appears, twenty-eight years before the world, and to-day the strongest proof in its favor would seem to be that *homo sapiens* is no longer the last term in the evolutional series, but from him has been evolved, either by "natural selection" or a survival of the fittest, "a new species," which Professor Huxley designates the "man of science." Even with such proof, however, it yet remains what Professor Huxley himself has pronounced it, "but still a hypothesis, and not yet a theory of species."

But even with the failure of these two positions—agnosticism and evolution—there yet remained a hope for Professor Huxley. Agnosticism was a philosophical, or contra-philosophical, or sophistical position, if you will, and a taint of the same serpent was upon evolution; but there yet remained the geological record, pure and undefiled by metaphysics or logic. It was the pure metal of science, bright and shining, and unadulterated with even the smallest alloy of philosophy—swift, sharp, and death-bearing as a bullet of steel. It was—the facts of paleontology in conflict with the first chapter of Genesis. And upon this Mr. Huxley naturally staked all his remaining hope. But, as it would seem, in vain. The scientific huntsman, to borrow the figure of Hume, with an acknowledged "love for the chase," and who, like Professor Huxley, candidly avows that liking for the sport "is mingled with a little human weakness to be thought a good shot," may well feel chagrined and vexed when, at the close of his day spent in the midst of game with little success, he loads his gun with his last and choicest cartridge, and under the impression that he has at last come upon game worthy of the marksman's skill and which will compensate for the day's disappointments, on firing, with fair and steady aim, he discovers that his rifle of unerring aim has been discharged at a mere decoy or too deceptive likeness. The general who sits down for weeks in siege of a fortress, and who has consumed all his provisions, wasted all his ammunition, and ruined his heavy artillery in levelling its walls, may well feel mortified when, at last, on carrying it by assault, he discovers that it was but an unfinished fort, neither gunned nor manned, and that the real fortress stood unharmed many leagues distant. And this seems to have been Professor Huxley's fate in opposing his geological record to the Mosaic cosmogony. A truly skilful general would make himself acquainted with the strong and weak positions of the enemy, would become familiar with the vital points, and would never be guilty of the folly of wasting his time and his resources upon a point unessential and unguarded. So renowned a biologist as Professor Huxley seems strangely unacquainted with the ecclesiastical anatomy. There are many points of most vital im-

portance in the Church's structure, well known even to babes and sucklings; but the point of Mr. Huxley's attack is not of the number. Regarding the Genesiac cosmogony, the Church has listened in her time to a great many opinions of scientists and philosophers, but has never seen fit to express her own. This may be owing to what a keen observer and unbeliever has styled "her supernatural rejection," or to the fact that her mission among men is not to teach physical science, but to save immortal souls. But to whatever cause it may be due, Mr. Huxley is strangely insensible to it, and arrays all the strength of his "heavy artillery" before it only to discover that he has been firing in the air. If he choose to demolish the Church, her "dogmas, which," he tells us, "ought to be fossil but are not," would seem to be the points to invite attack. They are not only important, but vital, spots in her anatomy. They are many in number, stretching from the Divinity of her Founder to the Infallibility of her Visible Head. They are bulwarks upon her ramparts, whose safety is essential to her very existence. They are not only golden clasps upon her girdle, but under each flows an artery through which her very life-blood courses. The thrust of Professor Huxley's sword-blade, destroying even a single one of them, will be fatal to her. Every drop of her life-blood will gush from the wound with a force which will defy every effort to stanch its flow. Rend one of her clasps in twain, and the girdle about her loins supporting her strength is irreparably broken. Shatter one of her bulwarks, and all her dogmas, her discipline, her liturgy, her ceremonies, will fall through the breach; but, instead of assailing any one of these points, Professor Huxley steps aside to quarrel with the *Hexahemeron* of Genesis, which he vainly imagines to be the key to all her kingdoms, and works himself into unnecessary anger because no one will dispute with him the position he has attacked. He seems not to be aware that if, in the field of physical science, he will determine the true meaning of the first chapter of Genesis, and fix it beyond mere peradventure, the Church will look upon him, not as an enemy, but as a most useful colleague.

The Church has no scientific doctrine regarding the cosmogony of Genesis to reconcile with the guesses of our present science. And with all due deference to the masterly effort of the ex-premier[1] to harmonize the accepted facts of our present science with the Proem to Genesis, all such attempts would seem to be works of supererogation. And if it be true of the "reconcilers," it is equally

[1] Mr. Gladstone may hold some private views upon the subject, and so may feel bound to effect a reconciliation, although such does not appear to be the case from his extremely lucid and able controversy with Mr. Huxley. He does not seem to be committed to any particular interpretation of the work of these six days.

true that those who oppose the geological record to the Mosaic cosmogony are engaged in the mere task of Sisyphus. It were a hopeless task to contrast or compare, to oppose or to harmonize, to antagonize or to reconcile two indeterminate objects; and never were two points less determined than those which the opposers seek to oppose and the reconcilers try to reconcile. The proposition to disprove the source of the Nile by the appearance of the North Pole, or *vice versa*, would be just as intelligible. An opposition or a reconciliation will have a meaning when it is clearly understood what the two points are which are to be opposed or reconciled. As has been said, the Church has never assigned any final meaning to the facts of physical science included in the work of the six days of the Mosaic narrative. Hence, from the side of the interpreters of Genesis there is no point of opposition. Indeed, Professor Huxley would be surprised to learn what diversity of opinion and latitude of interpretation may be found amongst Catholic exegetes regarding the cosmogonical or purely scientific part of the narrative. Simultaneity of creation; succession of creation; succession in the order of time, in the order of nature, in the order of cognition; the time of the six days, as we understand the term day, as signifying indefinite periods of time, as referring to one day with distinctions of six days, conformable with the presentation of the objects in the narrative; the terms morning and evening in the sense of beginning and end of work, in the sense in which we use the terms, in the sense of beginning and end of indefinite periods of time; all these have had their advocates within the very bosom of the Church, and as it was a question concerning physical science, with no especial bearing on men's eternal salvation, the Church, instead of interfering, looked placidly on. And it might be well for Professor Huxley to remember that these various opinions were held by exegetes long before the geological record existed, even in protoplasmic condition, or paleontology held the high rank with which it is now honored, and hence, are by no means a recent invention of theologians to offset the sophistry of scientists. The age of Augustine was long anterior to the age of Professor Huxley, and St. Thomas lived and died in total ignorance of the great antiquity of the Belemnite; yet the opinion of the former, sanctioned by the opinion of the latter, will give ample room to Professor Huxley for all sound deductions from his geological record when completed, without danger of the slightest conflict or opposition. And Augustine and Thomas Aquinas are names which the Church loves to revere, and to whose laurel crowns of learning she has superadded the aureola of the saint. It is, then, difficult to see precisely the point of Christianity which Professor

Huxley, with the open geological record in his hands, feels forced to anathematize.

And it may be added that it is quite difficult also to see how, from his imperfect record, he is justified in at all pronouncing anathema against anything of any consequence whatever. The geological record, according to it all the honor which belongs to it, is far from complete, and, it would seem, in the true sense of the word, will never be complete. The geological record of 1887 is by no means the geological record of 1837, and is little likely to be the geological record of 1937; and a harmony or discordance between any dogma of faith and the record, at any one of these dates, would be slight warrant that a like harmony or discordance would exist at any later date.

At the same time, however, it must be admitted that it is a sore trial to Professor Huxley, and almost more than human nature can be expected patiently to bear, to find that all the force of his "heavy artillery" has been spent even here on empty vacancy. Yet it is not quite so plain why the Church should be to blame for Professor Huxley's mistake. If in the height of his "enthusiasm" over his "heavy artillery of a new pattern" so highly "warranted," he chose to marshal all its strength in front of a position which he erroneously supposed belonged to the Church's dominion and to whose defence she was bound, it was evidently the mistake of overweening confidence and unreflecting enthusiasm. It is not surprising, however, in his chagrin and disappointment, to find him pertinaciously clinging to the hope of a conflict and begging orthodoxy to quarrel with his cosmogony on any ground, even for sake of the fight. "There must," he says in his despair, "be some position from which the reconcilers of science and Genesis will not retreat." It does seem cruel to disappoint Mr. Huxley, but, candidly, there seems to be not even a plausible pretext for a fight. And, indeed, were there a *casus belli* at all, of even the smallest dimensions, and were the Church committed even in the most indirect manner to the defence of even the weakest hostile position, it would be the height of cowardice to retreat when the strongest argument, put in Mr. Huxley's strongest language, sounds no more formidable than "*Undoubtedly*, it is in the highest degree *probable*." "It is testified by all the evidence we *possess*," "our *present* evidence," etc. And this, too, from a science in which undoubted facts and indubitable proofs should be the backers of certainty, and where the realm of probability should be entirely unknown. But even thus there seems hardly cause for a quarrel, and Mr. Huxley can box the compass of "water-population," "air-population," "land-population," in any order he pleases without the slightest violence to any doctrine, and

with little fear that his right to do so will be challenged in the name of religion by any orthodox theologian.

These, then, constituted the "heavy artillery of a new pattern warranted to drive solid bolts of fact into the thickest skulls," upon which Professor Huxley based his hopes of success; and it must be admitted that he worked industriously in the discharge of his artillery, that the crash was sometimes terrific, and the din and uproar was usually deafening. The world stood still on occasions to listen to the re-echoing thunder of his scientific explosions; but when we come to examine the number of killed and wounded, and the amount of real damage done to the enemy, the effect seems to be no more disastrous than if Mr. Huxley's artillery had discharged volleys of soap-bubbles.

In point of fact, not a single objection worthy of a moment's consideration has been brought against Christianity since the days of Hume,[1] notwithstanding the incessant tattoo of the drum scientific for the last half century.

And yet it would seem cruel to censure Professor Huxley too severely for his blind, precipitant rashness. It is a mere truism to say that all men are more or less swayed by some bias or other. But no stronger bias sways men's judgments than that of the specialty which lies in the line of their tastes and studies. The poet sees most things in life through the bias of poetry. The painter views the world with the eye of an artist. The broker views everything through the medium of the stock-exchange. Students of casuistic theology are sometimes harassed with scruples concerning the subject matter of their text-books. Medical students often imagine themselves the victims of the ailments included in the curriculum of their studies. Lawyers who make a specialty of criminal cases are said to regard the practice of law as the most degrading of the learned professions. And so of all others. Sensibly or insensibly, the favorite study or specialty, or pursuit or pastime, is apt to become the lens through which we view the

[1] In addition to the foregoing Mr. H. Spencer has within the last eighteen months given the world a catalogue of objections to Christianity, but they are remarkable only for their venerable antiquity. They are to be found in his controversy with Mr. Fred. Harrison, and their refutation can be drawn from any handbook of theology. The resuscitation of these objections by Mr. Spencer, however, tends to show that it is not alone in physical nature that the law of evolution is slow in its workings. Its processes seem quite as slow in the formation of objections to religion. For if, according to Mr. Spencer's original definition, *evolution is a change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity, through continuous differentiations and integrations*, we look in vain at the objections to revealed religion for symptoms of the *heterogeneity* to set in, and although these old objections have been so frequently buried beneath the overwhelming evidences of religion that they might now be justly classed as fossils of paleontology, there is not yet the faintest indication that the original *homogeneity* is likely to show the remotest sign of the desired *differentiation*.

objects we meet with, just as the air was filled with daggers for Fouché. The bias easily passes into a prejudice, and the prejudice is strong in proportion to our predilection or enthusiasm, and also in proportion to the absorbent nature of the subjects to which we have surrendered our powers. Few writers have taken pains to point out this so clearly as Mr. Herbert Spencer in his "Study of Sociology." He has called attention to the fact that men's fears and hopes betray into false estimates, that beliefs are distorted by sympathy or antipathy, that unjust condemnations arise from impatience, that the bias of class, the bias of education, the bias of country, the bias of theology, the bias of politics originate a predisposition to the acceptance or rejection of opinion and theories; but what he has failed to show is that the most tyrannical bias of all is that of physical science. There are few more subtle or more potent influences than that of matter over mind. It is hardly necessary to remind the physicist that his study gradually acquires an all but absolute dominion over his mind, and that it requires a desperate effort to relax what Emerson calls "the despotism of the senses." His facts and experiments are apt to enslave the mind and enthral its faculties. His "functions" and "processes" are apt to become part and parcel of his very existence. His dissecting knife, his weights and measures, his laws and classifications become a part of himself. He cannot see beyond his experiments. The world is narrowed down to the dimensions of his laboratory, and there is nothing in nature which cannot be reached by his appliances. Everything existing is merely matter with its molecules and modes of motion. Professor Huxley himself admits that "an exclusively scientific training will bring about a mental twist as surely as an exclusively literary training." And Emerson only uttered a great truth when he said that "empirical science is apt to cloud the mind, and the very knowledge of functions and processes to bereave the student of the manly contemplation of the whole. The best read naturalist, who lends an entire and devoted attention to truth, will see that there is much to learn of his relation to the world, and that it is not to be learned by the addition or subtraction of known quantities." And the mental equilibrium necessary for a sound judgment is obtained only by what the same writer has felicitously styled "self-recovery."

It were asking the impossible, then, to expect that the views of life held by scientific men would not be colored with their science, or that their philosophy would not be tinctured with the researches of the laboratory. But when has the study of physics failed to tempt its devotees to theory and speculation? As well hope to live in Wall street or in the Exchange and escape the contagion. The waysides of science are strewn with the corpses of defunct theories.

The world is filled with wrecked philosophies at one time or other stoutly defended and hotly argued by men of science in the first flush of their bewitching dreams. Professor Huxley admits that "mere insanities and inanities have before now swollen to portentous size." And it would seem that, amid all its multitudinous discoveries, science has not yet come upon the amulet which will ensure the wearer against the deceptions of physical nature, or teach him the folly of theorizing. Even now, when the Puck scientific, or the Puck philosophic, or the Puck agnostic undertakes to bewilder poor mortals, the mischievous sprite seems to copy with success the pranks of Robin Goodfellow, and sing, as he leads,

> "I'll follow you, I'll lead you about, around,
> Through bog, through bush, through brake, through brier."

It is, then, the science that is at fault, and to expect of Prof. Huxley and his colleagues that they would pass through the laboratory without its leaving any trace upon their minds, to suppose that they could divest themselves of the prejudice which it creates, and prove superior to the bias which it engenders, that they would rise superior to all speculation and theorizing—the inevitable outcome of laboratories—would be to regard them as superior to all human weakness, and far superior to human nature in firmness of mind and rigid beatitude of reason.

And, even though it might be expected that they could rise above all the petty tricks of human weakness in the ordinary studies of physics, such a hope would be setting far too high a platform, and asking too much of the heroism of unbending self-denial, when we come to consider the special studies which engaged their minds and the nature of the sciences which asserted their undisputed sway over the empire of their intellects. A study already sufficiently absorbing in its nature to engross the powers of the human mind, and hold the intellect in willing captivity, is suddenly clothed with a new beauty and arrayed in a new light. Matter, with its astounding variety of forms, with its ever-varying regions of interest, with its multiplicity of wonders, with its multitudinous possibilities of analyzation, its cohesions and repulsions, had opened up countless fields of endless variety. Mechanics and hydraulics, the statics and dynamics of the universe, the vast field of chemical analysis, mineralogy, botany, the natural history of birds and beasts and fishes, were already captivating enough to hold numbers of willing slaves in a species of intellectual thraldom. But here were new fields of enchantment to be added to the old—fields of which poet had not dreamed or prophet foretold. The wayside mosses and lichens had furnished food for the poet's fancy. Water, air, earth, sky, were teeming with living wonders:

but who would have dreamed that beneath our feet lay the greatest wonder of all, that in stones and rocks were to be found not merely sermons, but a history, traced in indelible characters by the hand of nature herself—a history, too, which gave a new meaning to antiquitv, and compared with which the earliest beginnings of recorded history were but of yesterday? A perpendicular section of a fossil bed had disclosed to the wondering eyes of scientific beholders marvels surpassing credibility. There, in a few feet of earth, were stored museums of anatomy rich in historical wealth and physiological interest. There lay an animal, a vegetable, and a mineral world, hidden beneath our feet, just as the new world lay beyond the ocean, or the trackless and countless worlds of the astronomer hid themselves in space. There were nature's catacombs, with its vaults and crypts filled with specimens of its own embalming and preserving—awaiting the hands of the scientific Schliemann or De Rossi. There were birds and beasts and shells and plants older than the pyramids, older than Chaldean legends, older than the Nile or the Euphrates. The historian might love to follow history into tradition, and tradition into legend and fable, until even fable is lost in conjecture; but here was history neither legendary nor fabulous, and yet older than Sirius or the Pleiades. It was history, but it was something more. It was a subterranean museum of an antiquity inconceivable, with specimens of birds, of beasts, of fishes, of shells, of fauna and flora more rich in variety than the llanos and pampas of Brazil, more strange and novel than those which greeted the astonished eyes of Banks and Solander when they gazed upon the strange trees and shrubs and plants and animals that lived and died beneath the Southern Cross. There the naturalist might feast his soul upon ever-varying species in plants, in animals, in birds, in reptiles, in fishes; here, he might compare and discover likeness and unlikeness, form and development, and all of a race upon which man's eye had never looked, and of which a single living specimen, at the present time, would be one of the world's greatest wonders. And all this crowded into a fossil-bed a few feet in extent hidden away by nature in forgotten places, as the squirrel hoards nuts or the miser forgets where he has hidden his gold. Galleries of storied wonders were opened to the naturalist at every step. New avenues lined with marvels stretched away beyond the confines of time, beyond what the mind could conceive, into ages so remote that the brain reeled at the mere contemplation of the changes which our planet must have undergone since their existence. To find a world as real as that in which we live, to behold it teeming with relics of life now extinct, to trace that life in all its departments, to study a strange anatomy, to discover a new species, to classify, to compare, to con-

struct a skeleton from the mouldering bones, to find a tusk or a claw or a single bone, and search with the industry and pertinacity of a ragpicker until the whole was constructed; to trace the history of this extinct race of animals, to count the rolling ages, and calculate the endless years during which the filtering of rains and the crumbling of rocks had dismembered their skeletons, or since those creatures strode the wastes of land and water. To conceive the strange conditions under which they lived, so different from the present; the herds of megalosauri roaming through vast plains; the strange monsters of the water, and the water equally strange; the strange surface of earth, the strange vegetation, the pleiocene forests beneath whose trees the pleiocene mammals suckled their young and preyed upon their kind; the meiocene rocks over which the ancestors of our modern chamois browsed and skipped; the strange birds with their strange notes, which laid their eggs and built their nests in fauna and flora of countless æons; the strange skies, the strange aspect of the heavens; the novelty of discovery and the sacredness of antiquity, the strangeness of species, and the familiar physiology of genus;—little wonder that the imagination should usurp the seat of judgment and lord it over all the powers of reason! To ask the scientist to keep his mind from theory, and keep his judgment clear and cold, was simply to ask the impossible. Milton in paradise, Dante in heaven, hell, or purgatory, had not beheld such visions; and the ground from which their imaginations soared were intangible and appealed not to the sense of feeling or sight. Rider Haggard, with not even the pretext of a history to build upon, expands his imagination. But here were living realities, real to the eye, to the touch, as true as nature herself; as real as the plants that grow in the field, or the flocks that graze on the hillside. There is no alternative; the devout scientist must be either a block of granite or an ardent enthusiast, and to ask him to make a covenant with his imagination that it might not run off into reckless speculation, were to ask the absurd or impossible. To expect of him that, under the fire of this all-consuming study, he should possess a coolness of judgment which was proof against all hallucination and delusion, would be to endow him with qualities which might have belonged to a fossil race of men, but not to the present. It was little wonder that the student who completely surrenders his mind to the new and absorbing study should become the child of enthusiasm, that his imagination should run riot, that endless fields of speculation should fill his mind, that he should grow giddy and intoxicated, revel in the highest flights of fancy, and place no limit whatsoever to his unfolding hopes. What wonder that Mr. Spencer should grow sceptical, that Professor Tyndall should grow overbearing and arrogant,

that Professor Haeckel should grow rash and insolent, and the "Hercules of mitigated scepticism"—Professor Huxley himself—should assume all these qualities together. No one who has the slightest sympathy with enthusiasm would be heartless enough to condemn or censure them.

It is by no means surprising that, with such incentives to enthusiasm, we should find Professor Huxley donning his war-paint, dancing his war-dance, and obstreperously calling for the blood of his enemies. It excites little wonder to see the "policeman of the world of thought" indiscriminating in his arrests and summary in his vengeance; or the "Hercules of mitigated scepticism" so reckless in the use of his weapons, and never stopping to question the unyielding temper of his "bolts." Indeed, few things have encouraged Professor Huxley in the indulgence of his folly more than the habit into which the world had fallen of regarding his "divagations" as symptoms of a mild mania, which meant nothing more serious than an attack of scientific enthusiasm which could hurt no one.

It may be due to this indulgent reception of Professor Huxley's humor that we have had, especially on this side of the Atlantic, so many weak imitations of Professor Huxley's method by men who have neither his industry to plead in excuse nor his ability to offer as an offset to their insolence; and the recent meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Science, in New York City, shows that we have yet with us some ambitious imitators of Professor Huxley whose aims are as high as they are harmless.

However, lest there might happen to be some who should be unacquainted with Professor Huxley's methods, and hence mistake his voice for that of a lion, so perfect is the simulation, let it be hoped that science will, in future, spare the nerves of orthodoxy, and save us from what Professor Huxley calls a "bogus scare." And since, in the language of honest Nick Bottom, "there is not a more fearful wild-fowl than your lion living," in order to preclude all danger of a panic when next again into its *Midsummer Night's Dream* scientific agnosticism is pleased to introduce the interlude of Pyramus and Thisbe, we trust it will insist that Bottom's judicious caution be enforced,—that he who personates the *lion* must follow the example of Snug the Joiner, and hence that he "must name his name and show half his face through the lion's neck, and he himself must speak through, and tell them plainly he is" not a real, living lion at all, but only Snug the Joiner, or Professor Huxley, the "man of science"—as the case may be.

PEACE, THE SWORD, AND ARBITRATION.

A PARLIAMENTARY "Motion," which was more amiable than practical, was hazarded last July in the British Parliament. Lord Bristol wanted it to be set down for a principle that the time had come when International Arbitration ought to take the place of flashing swords and booming guns. We have now passed, said Lord Bristol, beyond the ages of barbarism, and are in full sail on the calm seas of civilization; therefore, let the huge armies which now suck the strength of Europe, and which menace every neighbor with destruction, be exchanged for a simple Court of International Arbitration, which shall peacefully settle the rights or wrongs of every quarrel. A very Christian and a very beautiful sentiment! Unhappily the Powers, which possess the big armies, are like big school boys who hold smaller boys in fear, and who have no thought of abrogating the superior position in the world's school which superior muscle or mighty stature may insure. The world is as little disposed, in these days of "civilization,"—which is only a barbarism tempered by experience,—to forego the sweet luxury of cutting throats or smashing skulls, as it was in the days of Julius Cæsar. True, the motives have somewhat changed in the last few centuries, but the passions and the sentiments are the same. The three millions of soldiers who now constitute the peace-footing of the armies of civilized Europe—a number which can be increased to eleven millions, should the dogs of war be let slip from the leash—are not kept in preserve for the purpose of conquest so much as with the object of self-protection. Thus, Austria may be said to "want" a big army, because the diverse nature of her aggregated peoples requires material force for unification. Russia,—which is principally inhabited by three classes: (1) those who worship the rule of the Russian Czar; (2) those who desire the union of Slavonic races; (3) those who hate the Czar and the whole rule of effete Absolutism,—has a very strong motive for keeping up a big army, which may be wanted more at home than abroad. France wants a big army for revenge; and Germany wants one for consolidation. The smaller powers, such as Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, or even Portugal, want only a sufficient army for self-protection. But whatever the motive, that motive is beyond the influence of any kind of International Arbitration—unless it be backed up by allied powers. Doubtless a peaceful court of equity might be accepted, at least in principle, for the settlement

of merely ephemeral misunderstandings—just as the Maine Boundary, the Alabama Damages, the San Juan dispute, were settled by commissioners or by referees—but on points which are *worth* fighting about, no nation which is powerful will submit to the arbitrament of a weaker nation. To suppose that a power, with half a million of men in the field, will sit down gently and wait for a lecture or for advice from a few highly respectable members of a debating club,—be it in Paris, London, Berlin, or New York,—is to suppose what all the lessons of modern history demonstrate to be contrary to modern nature. We no more expect a strong country to take advice as to its possessions, its boundaries, its self-aggrandizement, or its national status, than we expect a man who has a hundred thousand a year to be advised to part with his property to a poor man. A burglar has only one precept of morality, and that is to get off without being caught. Nations—that is, their governments—are only burglars *plus* an army which can enforce the burglarious views that are most convenient, and *minus* a penal code which, though applied to individuals, has no place in the lofty ethics of annexation.

Lord Salisbury, when replying to the motion of Lord Bristol, dismissed it as too visionary, too utopian to be ingrafted into practical legislation. Yet might he not have utilized the opportunity by suggesting that, at least in one instance, an International Arbitration might be practicable? It may happen, from time to time, that between the two great English-speaking races—the inhabitants of the United States and of Great Britain—ephemeral misunderstandings may arise, which need nothing but a little talk for their *solatium*. Though it be absolutely impossible that the sword should ever be drawn between the two divided countries which are as one country, yet a friendly court of arbitration might be antecedently set up, ready to "sit" on any dispute which might arise. Next to a defensive and offensive alliance between the sea-divided members of one family [an alliance which could not fail to be an assurance of peace not only to themselves but to half the world], a permanent court of arbitration might be helpful to a security against even a superficial irritation.

To enter, however, on a broader view of a subject which necessarily embodies many points: Catholics will have read with interest the June letter of Pope Leo XIII. to Cardinal Mariano Rampolla, in which His Holiness sets forth certain principles of Catholic wisdom which should dominate the world's conduct in regard to strifes. "We have sought every means to reconcile them" (princes and peoples) "with the Church by renewing and drawing closer the family ties of the Holy See with various nations, and by everywhere re-establishing religious peace." His Holiness

shows that the great bond of the peace of the nations ought to be their obedient union with the Holy See; that it is the enemies of all religion who have stirred up the misapprehension which now exists as to the papal prerogatives; and that merely national convenience, or unity, or consolidation is as nothing in value compared with that true stability which "alone constitutes real progress for man, by leading to his intellectual and moral perfection." It is well to allude briefly to such points, in connection with the present aspect of the fighting world. There cannot be a question to any Catholic that the highest Court of Appeal is the Holy See—in regard to the moral side of national quarrels. This fact is, however, practically ignored; and from the same disregard has sprung the almost total indifference to the whole question of morality in national strifes. Indeed, governments care no more for Christian justice, when they set their hearts on what they are pleased to call Annexation [but what, in blunt English, and when practised by individuals, is called theft, or appropriation, or swindling], than they care for the number of souls whom they may send into eternity by the brute force with which they carry out their arguments. Manifestly a court of equity is as much *needed* for all the nations as it is *despised* as being impracticable or utopian. Governments are so well aware that, in international quarrels, politics will take precedence of principles, that they feel it would be affectation to discuss the question of morals, when the foregone purpose is to remove their neighbor's landmark.

If, however, we are to consider earnestly and religiously the *idea* of International Arbitration, it is necessary, antecedently, that we should apprehend the first principles on which governments ought to make war or to preserve peace. It is not too much to say that the morals of Modern Europe, in regard to the right or wrong of the use of force, are the weakest—nay, the most wicked—which have ever been known in the world's history since the time when the book of Genesis was written. Almost every condition of a just war has been violated in almost every war of Modern Europe. The conditions of a just war are as clear as they are absolute—as obvious in nature's Religion as in the Christian Religion. Before considering further the question of Arbitration, let us glance at the primary conditions of a just war, since those conditions seem to have passed out of the memory of the "Christian" governments which now wage war *without* conditions, *without* justice.

It might seem presumptuous to remind statesmen, in the year 1887, of the elementary principles of right and wrong, were it not patent to the world's eye that, in the matter of making war, not one statesman in a score remembers justice. Well, take a few of the more recent of military conflicts, and see whether this accusa-

tion be too strong. As to Afghanistan, the refusal of Shere Ali to receive an armed, military embassy was the pretext for the second invasion of his kingdom; the pretext for the first invasion having been an entry in a Parliamentary Blue Book, which entry was afterwards proved to be fictitious. An English Minister ordered the invasion of the Afghan territory with all possible slaughter and devastation; and this, not upon one, but upon two occasions, with the sublime, the Christian apology that "a scientific frontier" was desirable for English protection in the East. And next, take the case of the recent war in Egypt, conducted against a people struggling for their liberties, and under a tyranny that neither Americans nor Englishmen would have meekly endured in their own lands, and conducted, really and truly,—all affectation put aside,—in the interests of the bondholders of Egyptian stock. Thirdly, take that hideous war of the Russians, levied against the (nationally) innocent Turks, on the plea that certain "atrocities"—astutely fomented by Russian agents—had been committed in a certain district against Russian Christians. Hundreds of thousands of lives were sacrificed in a few months in revenge for the cruel slaughter of a few Bulgarians; which slaughter (as every one who is behind the scenes in Eastern diplomacy knows too well to require to be informed) was stimulated for the sake of creating a sufficient pretext for waging a religious war against Turkey. Lastly, take that horrible Franco-German war, waged because of the supposed choice of a king of Spain by a power which was rapidly becoming too military; a choice of a king of Spain which had *not* been made, which never has been made, and which probably never was meant to be made.

Now in every one of these instances there was the almost absolute ignoring of every one of the primary conditions of honest war. Let us glance at those primary conditions so ignored, so despised, yet at the very root of national honor, national safety.

Briefly, no one nation may make war on another nation, save for injuries committed, and not atoned for. Nor may any nation declare war until the people to be attacked have had full time to offer recompense, or to ask for pardon. Nor may any government declare war until the cause, the justification, has been fully set before the minds of all its subjects, and those subjects have fully approved the (apparent) justice. Nor may any nation *make* war without *declaring* war, and doing this with amplest advertisement to the whole world of a just cause, just processes, just monitions. No nation may make war for the sake of conquest, nor for the detestable gain of "removing its neighbor's landmark." Nor may any soldier take part in an unjust war,—in any war which he himself believes to be an unjust war,—for in so doing he is guilty of

homicide or of murder, and is no better than a hired assassin of innocent people.

"A Christian ought to let himself be killed rather than shed blood without cause," said Pius the Ninth, in a brief addressed to Monsieur Brun, and to several members of the French National Assembly. The same principle was held sacred by the virtuous Pagans, by every one of the sublime worthies of the Old Testament, and by all Catholic saints, doctors, and philosophers. He who invaded another's territory, in the days of the civilized Pagans, was called a robber, a pirate, a madman. Not only such great writers as Aristotle taught that war could not be made without just cause; or that, as Cicero said, "justice being wanting, war is not courage but ferocity"; but every one of the Pagan moralists assented to the doctrine that wars of pride or conquest were but brigandage. In the Old Testament, before and after the Deluge, we find the perpetual re-assertion of the same doctrine. The crime of Cain was the crime of vengeance in one person; it was an unjustifiable war upon one man. We know how it was punished by God. "Whosoever shall shed man's blood, his blood shall be shed, for man was made in the image of God," was a command which applied in the plural number quite as much as it applied in the singular number. And so as to the laws on theft (which we, in these days, call by the polite word annexation). Abraham, when he had vanquished unjust armies, swore that he would take nothing, "from the woof of thread to the shoe latchet." The "honorableness" of such warfare sounds poetically just in these days of military fame and State-rapine, when "*natural* frontiers" are esteemed to be those which we should like to have, and "*scientific* frontiers" are esteemed to be those which we can manage to make; and when nations levy "indemnities" for the expenses they have been put to in murdering their innocent neighbors in an unjust war, after having first stirred up such wars from politic motives. The Christian races have sunk far below the Pagan races—below the (civilized) Greeks, Romans, Chinese, or Turks—in that they make war without any just reason, and then rob the vanquished to pay for the expenses of wholesale and diabolical murder.

It will be observed in the instances given of modern turpitude, such as the Afghan, Egyptian, Russian, and French wars, that scarcely one of the preliminary conditions was observed before fighting an enemy who was *not* an enemy. As to Afghanistan, Lord Grey said in his place in Parliament, when alluding to the trumpery pretexts urged by Englishmen: "No one has attempted to prove that the Sovereign of Afghanistan had not the right to refuse to receive our armed embassy." But the *Times* newspaper remarked in a leading article that "an uncivilized State has never been held to have a

right to what we may term the full comity of nations." Mark here the imputation, "uncivilized." Who had decided that the Emir of Afghanistan was uncivilized, or who had decided that to refuse to receive an armed embassy was in itself a demonstration of uncivilizedness? "Uncivilized!" How can England lay any claim to be civilized? Why, in the last Russian war against Turkey, England did not lift a little finger to prevent the spoliation of the Turkish Empire, but actually hounded on Russia, till she reached Plevna; and then, afterwards, when the Turks were defeated,—prostrate before the huge army of Russia,—England calmly helped herself to the Island of Cyprus, under the pretense of aiding the Turks to defend themselves in the future, though she had just left them to be eaten up by Russia. And so, too, in the Afghan war; Russia promised *not* to send an embassy to Cabul. She sent one. And then the English proceeded to kill the Afghan people, but called the Czar of all the Russias their ally. What would Socrates, or Cicero, or Quintus Curtius (whom probably the *Times* newspaper would have called uncivilized) have had to say about a brigandage which had every element of cowardice, but not one of Christian chivalry or natural honor?

The Catholic teaching, as set forth in the Roman Catechism, is explicit in the defining of unjust wars. It both says what may be done and what may not be done. After saying what may be done, it adds: "with these exceptions all other is prohibited, whether as regards the person who kills, him who is killed, or the manner of killing. . . . No one is excepted; not the rich, not the powerful, not masters, not parents; but to all, without distinction or difference, it is forbidden to kill." "Oh, no," say modern statesmen; "in the interest of bondholders you may kill a whole nation which is *not* your enemy, and which is only struggling for its liberties against tyranny. For the sake of gratifying your vanity, or gaining your natural frontiers, you may send half a million men to be shot at by a neighboring nation, which has had the presumption to express an opinion as to the filling up of a vacant throne, without first asking *your* advice or direction. You may stir up local enmities in Bulgaria, as a pretext for marching your troops to Constantinople; or you may appropriate the temporal power of the Holy See to complete the picture of geographical Italian unity, or to please the people who have a strong objection to the Catholic faith. In short, in making war, you have never to consider justice, nor to conform to any of the requirements of the natural law as revered by Pagans, Chinese, Jews, and primitive Christians, but only to 'annex' what does not belong to you in the interest of your Stock Exchange, or for the gratification of the vulgar vanity of prestige."

There is a modern practice in Great Britain in regard to the making of war, which is thoroughly unconstitutional and illegal, yet which, strangely, hardly attracts any notice. Every one has heard of what is called "The Cabinet" in the English government, but no one has a correct idea of what it is, for the simple reason that it is as undefined as it is secret. It is not even recognized as constitutional; so that Macaulay could write of it: "It still continues to be altogether unknown to the law. The names of the noblemen and gentlemen who compose it are never officially announced to the public. No record is kept of its meetings and resolutions, nor has its existence ever been recognized by any Act of Parliament." Strange to say, this utterly anomalous and indefinable machine of State is, almost always, solely responsible for declaring war. During a recess, when members of Parliament are away in the country, the Cabinet will decide to commence an expensive war—possibly an unjust and barbarous war; and when the members return to town, and are preparing to pass minor acts for the economizing of the expenditure of the country, they are met by a set speech from some high official in the Government, informing them of what *has* been done and cannot be undone, and bidding them to grant the supplies without a murmur. The first Afghan war, the war with Persia in 1857, the first invasion of China, were all decreed in secret by that mysterious committee, "The Cabinet," and were "communicated," when too late, to the House of Commons. Thus the nation is kept in the dark as to the most important of its operations, and such as most involve its honor and safety. If Parliament happen to disapprove what has been done, possibly a vote of want of confidence may be passed; but this, at the most, can only produce a change of parties; it cannot undo the evil which has been begun; it cannot sheathe the sword which has been drawn.

Here, then, we have a violation of one of the conditions of a just war: that the whole nation ought to be consulted as to whether it is satisfied as to the natural justice of a war in which *the whole nation is to engage*. The modern idea is that two or three Ministers can make war, and that the whole nation is to be bound by their decision. Was there ever a more absolute dictatorship? Not the Crown, not the Parliament, not the nation, not even the Privy Council, is to decide upon what is the whole nation's business; but only a secret committee, of which Macaulay justly said that not even the men who compose it are known to the public, nor is any record kept of its meetings or its resolutions, nor has its existence ever been recognized by the Parliament.

That such an anomaly should be firmly rooted in a "Christian" country is sufficient proof of the low ideas of "Christian" morality

which now prevail in England in regard to war. Indeed, war has come to be looked upon—by almost every Christian government—as an unfortunate accident of such "politics" as have been intellectually worsted by more or less villainous diplomacy. Neither the Divine law nor the natural law is assumed to have a right of hearing, when vulgar greed, vulgar ambition, points to war. Yet, if we accept the teachings of the Catholic doctors on this subject, there is perfect accord and unanimity in what they say. In an excellent and most valuable little work on the guilt of blood-shedding, by the late Mr. Monteith, of Carstairs,[1] the testimonies of Catholic authorities are arrayed, from the earliest down to quite recent times. St. Thomas Aquinas is largely quoted; so is St. Bernard; and so are many of the mediæval Popes and saints. It will suffice here to note the doctrine common to all: that (1) subjects are not bound to obey their civil rulers in all things, the right of the civil ruler, as also of the military ruler, being limited by the moral, which is the Divine law; so that if the civil or military ruler command an immoral war, subjects and soldiers are not bound to obey, for in doing so they would commit homicide or murder. "When the Emperor commands one thing and God another, the Emperor must be condemned, for God we must obey." (2). Superiors can be "in injustice" in two ways: if they exercise an authority which is usurped, if they command that which is unjust. (3). There are three obediences, or kinds of obedience: First, to obey in that which is of obligation, and this will suffice for our salvation. Secondly, to obey even in those things in which we are free, and this is what is called aiming at perfection. Thirdly, to obey commands which are unlawful, and this is blind obedience, and is criminal. Thus, St. Sylvanus said: "We despise the laws of Rome that we may keep the laws of God." Tertullian said: "We are obliged to be under subjection in all obedience, according to the precepts of the Apostle, to magistrates, to princes, and to powers; but always within the limits of Christian discipline." And, finally, to join together the old and the new—Pope Leo XIII., while teaching obedience to authorities, even under the most trying humiliations and persecutions, "draws the line" at obeying criminal commands. "It is never allowable to obey the will of legislators or rulers when they command things contrary to the natural or the Divine laws." These few fragments will suffice to show the spirit of theologians, which is in perfect harmony with the spirit of the New Testament, as it is with the spirit of the (civilized) Pagans, but which is in direct contrast with the spirit of modern statesmen, and, indeed, with the whole temper of modern thought.

---

[1] Published by Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. London.

And now, if we return to the question with which this paper was opened: Would "International Arbitration," in Lord Bristol's sense of the words, avail to the putting an end to unjust wars? the answer, perhaps, is twofold: the institution would be impracticable; and, even if it could exist, would be ineffectual.

It would be impracticable, because wars are not now made in the cause of justice, but in the cause of wounded pride or vulgar greed. Passion, not principle, makes war. We may remember how, when the King of Prussia was supposed to have insulted a French envoy, M. Emile de Girardin wrote to a friend: "If we tolerate this, no lady in Europe will ever again take a Frenchman's arm." The inference was a good deal bigger than the premise! Unless there had existed an *a priori* ground of jealousy, it is certain that a mere breach of etiquette might have been atoned for by an invitation to dinner. It was jealousy—military and national vanity—which was on the lookout for a pretext for rushing with fixed bayonets "to Berlin," and which was punished by the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. The same category of sentiments might operate to-morrow in hurling the same two big nations at each other. Arbitration would be of no more use than a dinner party. Just as when two men fight a duel, they do so, not to settle who is in the right, but to relieve themselves of the imputation of cowardice, so two nations make war for the gratification of such sentiments as lie outside justice and truth. Fifty years ago Frenchmen hated Englishmen. To-day they hate the Germans—and for a similar reason. Twenty years ago the Southern States hated the Northern States; and how small, how insignificant, was the first little fan of flame which led to one of the most terrible of civil wars! Of religious wars, dynastic wars, conquest-wars, it may be said that their promptings have been human *feelings*, much more than the love of justice and truth. In the last three centuries has there been one "Christian war," fulfilling all requirements of Christian conditions? And is there to-day any promise of a higher standard? Is there to-day any promise of "Christian" nations becoming disposed to submit their every quarrel to an Arbitrator? *Whom* would an angry nation accept as an arbitrator if its *feelings* were more pronounced than its *ethics?* Especially now that European feelings are backed by a practical argument in the form of about eleven million soldiers, it is evident that the nation which had the biggest portion of this practical argument would consider that it had also the stoutest ethics. *Whom*, then, let it be asked, would the nations accept as an arbitrator in a quarrel which was one of feelings, not one of ethics, but which might receive its quick solution by a simple sum in arithmetic: "How much stronger is my big army than your small army?" Take the exceptional case

of Russia's influence in the Balkans. Russia has no real quarrel with the Bulgarians, but she has interests which the Bulgarian government might gravely thwart, but which Russia would never permit to be thwarted. Is it likely that, if Russia came into collision, say, with Austria, through the indirect influence of the Bulgarian question, Russia would submit to a ruling which might throw her back in the aspirations which she has been cherishing for about a century and a half? Or again, if Russia knows that a big war, at a given moment, is the only diversion from internal strifes and revolutions, will Russia care a pin for all the arbitrators in the world, any more than she will care for Catholic morals? Germany, too, which is military through and through,—military in even her private domestic life,—is not likely to want any arbitrator but her own nation of soldiers, whom she keeps always "up to drill," ready to "arbitrate." England, which has just been amusing itself with a mimic warfare, in the way of attacking its own coasts with its own fleet, would refer first, if not solely, to its armor-plated arbitrators, assisted by the judicial wisdom of its red-coats and of some hundred and twenty thousand volunteers. We cannot find any nation in the civilized world [civilization, as has been said, is only a barbarism tempered by experience and complacency] which would put ethics before feelings, honesty before gain, or canon law before that delightful fraud, annexation.

That question, "Whom?" is the really difficult one to answer. Catholics know well that, on the ethical side of a quarrel, the Supreme Pontiff is the proper arbitrator for the nations. But then the nations do not care for the ethical side. This is the primary hitch in the inquiry. All nations might say at once: "Yes, if wars were to be determined solely by the interpretation of the Divine law, we should concede to you that the Supreme Pontiff ought to be the arbitrator in every quarrel whence war might be, sooner or later, developed. But since, in these days, while you are conducting a grave inquiry,—submitting your *pros* and *cons* to the Holy See,—your enemy will have marched his army across your frontier, and will be knocking your capital to pieces while you are intellectually occupied in discussing the beautiful philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas; we must have material arbitrators to keep our enemy at a respectful distance *before* we discuss principles or lofty ethics." There is much truth in this irony of the armed nations. The rapidity of military movements outstrips the delicate consciences of Christian nations, Christian governments, Christian soldiers. Facts have to be dealt with as soon as principles. A man need not say his prayers when he sees a burglar in his bedroom, if he happen to have a poker ready to resist the burglar.

It is perfectly obvious that, in our own times, when the railway and the telegraph bring the future into such close proximity with the present, and when the *fact* of standing armies, ready to seize on momentary pretexts, has to be reckoned with as an irrefutable argument, nations cannot resolve themselves into councils of moralists, who will not stir till they have referred their quarrels to arbitration. Yet, true as all this is, it does not affect the principle that in the *first* incitements to all wars the Divine law has to be considered *before* conquest, national pride, or annexation. In almost every one of those modern wars which have been referred to, there was ample time beforehand for the consideration of justice; so that those wars were mainly murders and robberies, in the gravest possible violation of the Divine law. There was ample time for Russia to know that to destroy Bulgaria—a peaceful province disturbed by Russian intrigues—was a cowardly and unjustifiable brigandage. There was ample time for Catholic France to have made up its mind that it had no right to kill a quarter of a million soldiers to revenge a supposed affront on a French envoy. Principles are not created by circumstances, but should control them, and be superior to wounded vanity. So thought the Catholic Knights,—the primitive armies,—whose definition of their duties was thus stated: "The office of the Knight is to maintain the Catholic faith, to protect women, widows and orphans, to defend men who are oppressed and feeble." The office of a modern army is to crush down the feeble, or those who are slightly feebler than itself. And the reason is that modern principles (which are no principles at all) exclude all consideration of the Divine law, and thus, in real sense, destroy liberty. In England, where "obedience to Rome" has long been ridiculed as having in it something degrading, if not immoral, the state is accepted as though it were infallible—in the sense that the national obedience is rendered to a Cabinet Council, which secretly decrees an unjust war: an inversion of the true principle of obedience, as well as a complete surrender of national liberties. Nations have come to abrogate their dignity in losing their national right to judicial estimates; suffering themselves to be led into criminal excesses, under cover of their complete ignorance of secret intrigues; or through indifference to the Divine and the national law, as to the conditions on which alone war can be justified. Nations of brigands, of professional assassins, who are *without* judicial decrees, without even an outward form of judicial process, hurl themselves against other nations without so much as "declaring" war, but immediately upon a "proclamation" that they mean to fight. Barbarism, in its worst ages, did the same thing. But the Attilas of barbarous

days, and their hordes, did these things *without* boasting of civilization. Nor did they call themselves Christians.

That question, "Whom?" still waits for an answer amid the embarrassment of the various suggestions for arbitration. What if we adopt the proposal of Henry IV. of France, that the Christian nations should constitute a National Council at Rome, under the presidency of the Pope for the time being, to judge of causes of war and of its equity, and to report to all nations their judgments? Pope Sixtus V. approved of this idea, and was not unwilling that even Queen Elizabeth should take part in it. If no other good came from such an institution, at least a knowledge of common law would be widely spread, and this could not fail to be beneficial. Other and similar proposals have been initiated, with a view to rendering practical a law of nations. Thus a proposal was made, not long since, by Mr. Urquhart, which, though it was only a little more than academical, was in recognition of the grave wants of our time. This proposal was the formation at Rome of a college which should be exclusively diplomatic, in which the rules and principles of the law of nations and their application to international affairs should be taught in scholastic method and exactness. Though the idea was not brought to any practical result, it was discussed at the time and with favor. Certainly in no branch of the higher studies,—and in no branch even of purely legal study,—does the general student show less care or critical interest than in that branch which treats of making nations and unmaking them.

Yet apart from what may be called statutable considerations, does not common sense suffice to show that, in *national* quarrels, there should be the same observance of common decencies as in *personal* quarrels? Two "gentlemen" do not fly at each other's throats without some little preliminary of conciliation. Still less does any gentleman proceed to "annex" his neighbor's property,—his fields, or his houses, or his silver-plate,—without at least considering that there is an old idea which is called honesty; that there are commandments which disapprove of picking and stealing; and that there is a criminal code which is positively harsh upon theft. If, then, in personal relations, what is called honor is highly esteemed, by what strange kind of reasoning can the plural number enjoy immunity from responsibilities which are absolutely imperious to the singular number? The late Father Frederick W. Faber said truly, and in his caustic way, that governments do things for which any gentleman or respectable person would be kicked out of every club and every drawing-room. "I want your territory," says one government to another; "it will give me a

scientific frontier." "But I would rather not part with it," replies the interrogated. "Very well," says the other, "then I will narrowly watch your conduct, and the moment you give me an excuse for picking a quarrel, I will be down on you and will take what you will not give." This standard of sense of honor, if it prevailed in private life, would lead to inconvenience—and to prison. Why should governments be guiltless of theft because they call it annexation, be guiltless of murder because they call it "military casualties," or be guiltless of lying because they call it diplomacy?

Some time ago a smart youth, who was indicted for stealing a dollar, pleaded admirably that, as his master stole thousands,—by adulterating almost everything which he sold,—he was only doing his little best to imitate his master's "politics," though unfortunately, "without the protection of the law." There lay the whole *gravamen* of the offence: "without the protection of the law," which *does* palliate certain crimes, when they are committed in the name of "business" or of "diplomacy." A government, like many a tradesman, will commit fraud systematically, and finally proceed onward to wholesale murder, under the "protection" of that conventional law which calls robbery annexation, and assassination the glorious onslaught of a disciplined army.

To suppose that arbitration will be accepted as a substitute for the easier method of appropriating Naboth's vineyard,—so long as governments can find pretexts for affirming that Naboth has rendered himself a bad neighbor,—is to suppose that modern Christendom will become suddenly regenerate, and care for justice more than for bondholders or frontiers.

PROTESTANTISM IN SPAIN.

PROTESTANTISM in Spain and the Spanish countries of America has been and is, like an exotic plant, incapable of becoming acclimatized, and doomed to fade away and die and disappear as soon as any sign of its purely artificial life begins to be perceived. It seems that there is in the inward spirit of the "Reformation," and in the principles and tenets of the various sects which owe to it their existence, something that prevents Protestantism from taking any fast hold upon Spanish soil, or making a deep impression on Spanish minds.

The spectacle, it is true, has been now and then given of a Spaniard by race, whether belonging to the mother country between the Pyrenees and the Straits of Gibraltar, or to any one of the Spanish republics and provinces of the New World, publicly abjuring his native faith and joining more or less actively and efficiently some one of the Protestant denominations. Sometimes it has been seen that a Spaniard, whether man or woman, impatient of the discipline of the Church, unwilling, for instance, to go to confession, or to submit to other rules, even less essential,—or when anxious to contract a marriage which the law forbids, or moved by the belief that occasionally has obtained great favor among political leaders, that the Catholic Church is antagonistic to civil constitutional liberty,—has become a member, more or less tepid and inactive, of the Episcopalian Church. It has been seen also, both in the past and in the present times, that a Spaniard or Hispano-American has placed himself at the head of some Episcopalian, and more rarely Methodist or Baptist, chapel, become a preacher, and tried to make proselytes. It has been seen, in fine, especially in our own times, that unscrupulous politicians, anxious to break down the barriers which the conservative elements of the Catholic Church oppose to their schemes, besides promoting infidelity in the name of science, and practising oppression and confiscation in the name of liberty, have opened their countries in the name of freedom of worship to all kinds of missions, Mormonism included, encouraged Protestantism, and provided it with buildings and with resources, which they took from the Catholics; nay, even in some cases made use of sheer force to drive into the new churches and chapels, at the point of the bayonet, the people who were destined to form their congregations.

But always and in all cases, the sectarian effort has proved to be

fruitless. Either it was isolated, and had only the most ephemeral result, or even when organized, and somewhat rooted, it ended only in the publication of one or more books, which few read, and which soon passed away from the memory of men, or in the establishment of religious associations, with no real vitality, and in not a few instances without any respectability. The individuals became indifferent, the congregations thinned out and dispersed; and the whole thing, becoming unsupported and discredited, fell to the ground, and passed away, leaving behind it scarcely any sign of its existence.

And this result, which may appear to many both singular and inexplicable, does not depend at all upon any special gift of the Spanish people which causes them to relish discipline and obedience. True it is that at the bottom of the Spanish heart there is always something inimical to changes and innovations, and that no mind can ever appreciate better than the Spanish whatever truth exists in the maxim, *omnis innovatio plus novitate perturbat quam utilitate prodest.* But it is also true that no people, unfortunately, is perhaps more apt than the Spanish to proceed by impulse; that no one is more restless, and resistive, and rebellious to all yokes; that no one is more prompt to risk all things, and go blindly even to the last extremities, when his pride is wounded, or when some principle cherished by him is endangered, and that no one has given such stupendous proofs of almost incredible perseverance in all his works and undertakings.

On the other hand, as far as religious matters are concerned, whatever may be said to the contrary notwithstanding, the Spanish people have not shown any exceptional amount of stanch, unflinching adhesion to the Catholic truth. History shows that, both in ancient times and in our own, Spain has always been a vast and fruitful field for heresy and infidelity. A book has recently been published in Madrid, written by a most competent person, with the approval of the ecclesiastical authorities there, giving, in three large volumes, a detailed account of the wanderings of the Spanish mind in religious matters. The "History of the Heterodox Spaniards,"[1] as the book is entitled, shows how early and how often, and how deeply sometimes, Spain has been afflicted in this respect. Before the year 254 of our Lord, Spain could claim already, with great reason, the doubtful glory of having had two heretical bishops and a heretical sect of no little importance, at least numerically. Those bishops were Basilides, the Bishop of Astorga, and Marcial, the Bishop of Merida; and they and their followers, who were called *libelaticos*, from *libellum*, the letter, or writ of immunity, which they

[1] "Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles," par Don Marcelino Menendez Pelayo. Madrid, 1880–1881.

succeeded in obtaining from the Roman authorities to escape persecution as Christians, gave the Church considerable trouble. In 276 there were also heretical errors widely spread in Spain on the Incarnation of the Divine Word. A Spanish Council, in the beginning of the fourth century, condemned some heresies which were then in vogue in that country. Spain has contributed to the world of error a large share of Arians and Donatists and Antitrinitarians. She has allowed herself to be agitated by women, as for instance Lucila, *potens et factiosa mulier*, as the contemporary writers call her, who founded a sect, believing, among other things, in rebaptizing the people, and Agape, another woman, rich and influential, who gave her name to the sect of the *Agapetas*. There have been on her soil, and at different periods, Gnostics, and Luciferians, and Priscilianists, and Origenists, and Manicheans, and Iconoclasts, and Albigenses, and Waldenses, and Averroists, and Deists, and Materialists, and Atheists, and Infidels. But by the side of all these, and other sects and creeds, and shades of creeds, there were always for centuries, in spite of the rigors of the Inquisition, which had to do with them more than with anything else, the two most hated Spanish dissidents, who respectively were called *Judaizantes* and *Mahometizantes*. The former were the Jews who had been converted to the Christian religion, and showed by their action that their conversion was not sincere, or adhered, more or less openly, to the Judaic doctrines; and the latter were the always hated and distrusted Moors, who, having embraced Christianity, still retained Mahometan practices or showed some tendency towards Mahometan ideas. Against both classes the Inquisition was specially directed, and the stubbornness of their resistance might furnish the good lesson, that nothing lasting or complete is accomplished through violence.

If to the host of heterodox Spaniards of all kinds and descriptions just alluded to, we add the Spanish Jansenists, the Molinists, the Regalists or Schismatists, and the other innumerable dissenters who have swarmed in Spain, it will be easy to understand that the true reason why Protestantism has not flourished in Spanish countries, and cannot flourish, is not because of any natural, inborn disposition of the Spanish mind which renders it repulsive to heresy; nor because, as stated by a Spanish enthusiast, the Spanish language is one not calculated to be the vehicle for heretical doctrines.

This conclusion will be strengthened by considering that neither the Spanish kings nor the Spanish people have ever shown any unusual disposition to submissiveness, respect, or even deference towards the Holy See. The Spanish kings have been surnamed, since the time of Ferdinand and Isabella, "their Cath-

olic Majesties," perhaps on the same principle as the kings of England are still called "defenders of the faith"; but neither Ferdinand and Isabella themselves, nor any others among their successors, have ever hesitated, for a single moment, in opposing the Pope, and even in using against him material force, when their personal and political interests were at stake. Familiar to all are the angry controversies between the Court of Rome and Ferdinand the Catholic, and the blunt, unceremonious, and thoroughly disrespectful way in which the Spanish Ambassador at Rome, Garcilasso de la Vega, dealt with the Pope, under express written instructions, which have been found and published. No less familiar are also the serious and repeated troubles and annoyances by which the Holy See was made to suffer under Charles V. and Philip II., even when it was filled by such great figures as Leo X. and Clement VII. The siege and sack of Rome, the captivity of the Pope, and many other incidents of great gravity, leave far behind them whatever other kings, not Catholic, might ever have done or attempted.

The contentions of the Spanish kings concerning what is called in Spanish *regalias de la Corona*, or crown privileges in Church matters, are too well known. They have led very often to the very verge of schism. Not long ago the struggle between Spain and the Holy See was still graver and based on larger and more serious grounds. Between 1833 and 1844 Spain remained all the time in open rebellion against the Church. The massacres of priests and monks, which took place in 1834, the abolition of the religious orders, the confiscation of the property belonging to them, the laws passed for the so-called "reformation and reorganization of worship and of the clergy," the dismissal of the Papal Nuncio, who on December 29th, 1840, was ordered to leave Spain and was carried by the Government agents to the Spanish frontier, the allocution of Pope Gregory XVI., of March 1st, 1841, and the government proclamation against it, and the encyclical letters which the Pope wrote in consequence of all these troubles, directing prayers to be said for the fate of the Spanish Church,—are all well-known events, which do not speak very well for the "filial piety" of the Spanish kings and people towards the Pope. For the whole of that time two-thirds of the episcopal sees of Spain remained vacant.

Another theory which has been suggested of late, in explanation of the fact of the total failure of Protestantism in Spain and Spanish America, which gives as its reason that persecution killed the movement and that the severity of the Inquisition nipped it in the bud, scarcely deserves consideration. It is neither complimentary to Spanish Protestant faith, if such a thing exists, nor is it ration-

ally and historically acceptable. It would be, indeed, most singular, astonishing in the extreme, especially among Spaniards, with whom stubbornness and tenacity of purpose constitute a second nature, that persecution by itself, unaccompanied by other circumstances, and unaided, could have accomplished that triumph. The severity of the Inquisition was not greater or sterner with Lutherans and Calvinists than it had been since its establishment, and was afterwards, with infidels, and sorcerers, and magicians, and heretics of other denominations, and baptized Jews and Moors falling back to their former religions. And, nevertheless, while the latter, with genuine Spanish perseverance and endurance, faced all dangers, and succeeded, in spite of all persecution, in keeping themselves alive and retaining their hold upon the Spanish soil, the former fell and disappeared.

It is well known, moreover, that the severity of the Inquisition has not been felt in Spain for many years, and that in Spanish America, even in the worst days, the power of that tribunal was scarcely felt.[1] But, nevertheless, neither in modern Spain nor in the Spanish Republics of America, nor in Cuba, nor in Porto Rico, have the fruits of Protestantism been better or more abundant. It has been given toleration and liberty, it has been encouraged and protected in every way, but it has not been fruitful. In Mexico, the police have even forced the poor people to get inside the new "Evangelical churches," and the poor Indians and natives, new forced adepts of free examination, have entered the buildings reciting a "Hail Mary" and making upon their breasts and foreheads the sign of the cross. In the island of Cuba, where, for almost inexplicable reasons, the Baptist form seems to have received some favor, there were in March, 1886, one "church" and five "missions" in the city of Havana, and three more "missions" in the cities of Matanzas, Cienfuegos and Peurto Principe respectively, all of them as weak and doomed to be as short-lived as possible.

On the other hand, if this argument of terror, not very complimentary to the strength of conviction and zeal of the Spanish Protestants, especially if compared with the stubbornness shown by all other heretics and dissenters, could in any way be taken into consideration, it would fall to the ground as soon as we turned our eyes to Italy, or, more properly speaking, to Rome, where the Inquisition existed also as an organized tribunal, zealous, of course, in inquiring into all kinds of errors and heterodox doctrines, and condemning them, but where no record exists of its having caused

[1] "On the other side of the seas, in the American regions," says Menendez Pelayo, "some little sparks of Protestantism were carried by foreign merchants and pirates. But they did not bring forth any noticeable result." "Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles," vol. ii., page 453.

any one to suffer capital punishment or to undergo the trials, terrible for various reasons, which were common in Spain. There was no terror there, there was no blood, there were no tortures; Protestantism could not meet there any opposition of this kind; and, nevertheless, it was and it remained as utterly incapable of rooting itself in the Italian soil as in the Spanish. All efforts made, the same in former times as now in our days, to implant Protestantism in Italy, have invariably proved abortive.

The key to the problem is to be found, we think, in the undeniable fact that both Spain and Italy are the lands of art, of poetry, of imagination; that pomp and display and luxury in words, in musical sounds, in works of art of all kinds, are congenial to them; that they delight in tradition; that they glory in their past. Where such a disposition exists, where it grows and flourishes naturally, spontaneously, luxuriously, wildly, we might say, Protestantism in whatever form becomes an impossibility. It is the antithesis of imagination and art, it is the counterpart of tradition, it is the outcome of a desire to demolish the past and build upon its ruins a different structure. Spaniards and Italians may be, and often are, and have been schismatics, and skeptics, and rationalists, and atheists, and infidels, and indifferent to all religions; but seldom are they Protestants, and more seldom yet, and perhaps never, Protestants properly so-called and deserving of the name.

"The Reformation," Chateaubriand says,[1] "deeply imbued with the spirit of its founder, a coarse and jealous monk, declared itself, from its very first days, the enemy of the fine arts. It ignored imagination as a power of the human soul, and by forbidding its exercise it clipped the wings of genius and caused it to march on foot. It broke out on account of certain alms being asked to raise for the use of the Christian world the basilica of Saint Peter. Would the Greeks have refused the assistance solicited from their piety for the building of a temple to Minerva? Had the Reformation been completely successful from the beginning, it would have established for a time, at least, another species of barbarism; viewing as superstition the pomp of divine worship, as idolatry the masterpieces of sculpture, of architecture and of painting, its tendency was to annihilate lofty eloquence and sublime poetry, to degrade taste by repudiating its models, to introduce a dry, cold and captious formality into the operations of the mind. . . . . In England, where an ecclesiastical hierarchy has been retained, literature has had its classic era. Lutheranism preserves some sparks of imagination, but Calvinism aims at utterly extinguishing

[1] "Historical Studies on the Fall of the Roman Empire, and the Rise and Progress of Christianity."

them, and so on until we come to Quakerism, which would reduce social life to unpolished manners and the practice of trades."

To the natural antagonism between the Spanish and the Protestant natures, if such language be permitted, the circumstance must be added that Protestantism attempted to implant itself in Spain under the Calvinistic form, and that form was the worst, or the least aptly devised to make an impression on the Spanish mind. The Spanish people, gay, frank, open-hearted, imaginative in the extreme, not by education or training, but by nature, could never look without a certain amusement on the stiffness of the Puritan, while his inconsistent intolerance and tyranny provoked their indignation. The execution of Miguel Servedo (Michael Servetus, or Servet, as his name was translated and has been transmitted to history), one of the very first Spaniards who embraced Protestantism, and who was burned alive in Geneva on the 27th of October, 1553, at the instigation of Calvin, who caused him to be arrested and who publicly boasted of his share in that tragedy, was a good lesson for the Spaniards. It is neither to the Inquisition nor to any Catholic power or authority that the responsibility for the taking of that life belongs. It rests entirely upon Calvin, who had proclaimed the emancipation of thought and free examination in matters of religion, and upon secular judges who had endorsed these doctrines.

Pure patriotism, and even national pride, would have also prevented at all times Calvinism, in any form, from acquiring domicile in Spain. A member of the Parliament summoned by Cromwell seriously discussed the proposition that all the records of the Tower be burned, that all memory of things past should be effaced, and that the whole system of life should commence anew. Who could persuade a Spaniard, who always lives in the past, to obliterate his history and to forget his glory?

On the other hand, the constant, the supreme aim of the Spanish people has always been the unification of their country. Step by step, inch by inch, we might say, the Spanish nation, divided and subdivided into many kingdoms and principalities and independent governments, extended its limits until it became consolidated in that powerful, centralized unity which aspired to be the universal monarchy (the dream of Phillip II., on whose dominions the sun never set). This aspiration towards unity, which was at the bottom of all the Spanish enterprises which astounded the world, was utterly and essentially inconsistent with the spirit of Protestantism, especially under the Calvinistic form, which was without hierarchy, without centralization. When Butler wrote his celebrated poem of "Hudibras" there were already, as remarked by the learned author of the biography of that poet, printed along

with his works, more than two hundred sects or shades of sects of Protestants, especially of the Calvinistic type; and, as the same author further says, with reason, "it is scarcely possible, in the regularity and composure of the present age, to imagine the tumult of absurdity and clamor of contradiction which perplexed doctrine, disordered practice, and disturbed both public and private quiet in that age, when subordination was broken and awe was hissed away, when any unsettled innovator, who could hatch a half formed notion, produced it to the public, when every one, man or woman, might become a preacher, and almost every preacher could collect a congregation."

Even if the hierarchy were to be preserved, and something in the shape of the Church of England were to be attempted in Spain, it never would meet the popular favor. The Spanish people would never have assented to give their kings any spiritual superiority over them. When monarchy in Spain was elective, the established form of giving the one chosen notice of his election, amply illustrates the Spanish character. "We," they said, "who are each one of us as good as you are, and who collectively are better than you, have made you our king." People of this temperament cannot acknowledge any spiritual allegiance to their temporal rulers.

Another consideration of paramount importance, in our judgment, which prevented Protestantism from rooting itself in the Spanish mind and heart, was its opposition to the honoring of, or devotion to, the Blessed Virgin. This devotion, intimately connected with the most heroic acts of the Spaniards in their long protracted struggles with the Moors, thoroughly interwoven with all that is Spanish, literature, art, legislation, the source of inspiration both for the masterpieces of Murillo and for the noble deeds of Spanish chivalry; spoken of and praised, and regulated by the oldest laws of Spain[1] preserved without alteration both in the statute books of Spain and in the Spanish hearts down to our own days;[2] witnessed by the very language of the people who utter the

[1] King Alphonso the Wise (1250) took pains to provide that all Saturdays in the year be consecrated to the Blessed Virgin, in recognition of the fact that she was the only one who preserved the faith in the promises of her divine Son, in the trying moments between His death and His resurrection. Friday, the day on which He died, was set apart as a day of sorrow, of fasting, of painful recollections and penance. Sunday, on the contrary, the day of resurrection, is all gayety, and rejoicing. On Saturday, between the two, the Apostles, disheartened, full of fear, sorrow, and consternation, hidden from the Jews, did not know what would become of them. The Blessed Virgin alone kept her faith and was confident that He would rise again from the dead. For this reason the king says "a festival should be made every Saturday in honor of St. Mary."

[2] King Charles III., otherwise memorable for his expulsion of the Jesuits, and the zeal with which he defended the "regalias," recognized by law, dated January 16th,

exclamation, "Ave Maria purissima," whenever an occasion of surprise, or joy, or sorrow, or any other emotion, presents itself to their souls, cannot by any means be eradicated, or dimmed, or obliterated, or even spoken of disrespectfully, in any Spanish country. It was under the banner of Our Lady of Covadonga that the Spaniards reconquered their country from the hated Moors. It was under the flag of Our Lady of Guadalupe that the Mexicans secured their independence. The glories of Lepanto are inseparable from the name of Our Lady of the Rosary. And the Spanish victory over Napoleon, and the recovery of Spanish independence, can never be remembered without uniting with them heroic Zaragoza and its most revered palladium, the Virgin of the Pillar.

Against the rock of this devotion all Protestant attempts will end in failure.[1]

The observance of the "Sabbath Day," as the Protestants say, is to be counted also among the obstacles which prevent Protestantism from ever becoming popular in Spain. He will be gifted, indeed, with almost supernatural power who can persuade a Spaniard that Sunday is not a day of rejoicing and gayety, or that it is sinful to play cards on that day, or attend a dancing party, or go to the theatre or to the bull-fight. The Spanish religious festivals are always connected in some way or another, with civil festivities. And if there is anything to which a Spaniard cannot get accustomed, and which he does not look at without astonishment, not unmingled with amusement, however well disposed he may be to respect others' opinions and customs, and to recognize the abuses to which those of his own country may give occasion, it is certainly the way in which Sunday is observed in England, or elsewhere, by Protestants of the old school.

Of course no one can attempt to justify the fact, almost universal in Spain, against which the author of the best Spanish Catechism of Christian doctrine[2] loudly protests, of celebrating, for instance, the festival of the patron saint of a town with "High Mass,

---

1761, "the universal patronage of Our Lady, in the mystery of her Immaculate Conception, over all the kingdoms of Spain and the Indies." At his petition, also, and in remembrance of this fact, the verse, "Mater immaculata," was added to the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, immediately after the verse, "Mater intemerata." He was also the founder of the Knights of Charles III., whose badge is a medallion with an image of the Blessed Virgin.

[1] The writer of this paper has had occasion to hear from the mouth of a Cuban lady who had fallen into the habit of attending the services of an Episcopal Church, and even taking communion in it, and did not believe in confession, or in many other things of our Church, the loud proclamation of her tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin, whose name she could not pronounce without tears coming to her eyes. That lady was a model of Christian virtues, and soon returned to her Church.

[2] "Catecismo explicado," by Don Santiago Garcia Mazo, canon in the Cathedral of Valladolid.

sermon, and procession, followed by dancing parties, and dinners, and bull-fights in some cases, or dramatic performances in others," the costumes of the comedians and all other paraphernalia of the performances being carefully preserved and stored for such occasions in the sacristy of the parish church; but no one can be persuaded, in Spain or in the Spanish countries, that it is wrong to indulge on Sundays in social gayety, or to receive friends and give parties, or innumerable other things which under Puritan rule might be crimes, and are of constant occurrence among them, in all classes of society.

To a certain extent, this Spanish feeling in regard to Sundays and holydays might be considered universal in Catholic countries. It prevails in France, in Italy, in Catholic Germany; and there, as in Spain, the thing is carried to excess.

The argument which sometimes has been heard from the mouth of disappointed missionaries, that Protestantism cannot flourish in Spain or the Spanish countries, owing to the bigotry or the ignorance of the Spanish people, needs no refutation. The most uneducated classes in Andalusia and other provinces of Spain leave far behind them in perspicuity of intelligence, and acuteness, and sharpness, the classes of the same kind in England and other nations where Protestantism has prospered; while the educated classes rank as high as the highest, as shown by their literature, their art, their science, at all times grand and monumental.

The "Reformation" penetrated into Spain in the very first days of its appearance in Germany. The way had been paved for it, had it been in any manner congenial to the Spanish people, by the almost constant and sometimes angry discussions between the Catholic kings and the Holy See, about the appointments of bishops and many other questions of great political importance. The popular agitation which these discussions stirred up was not calculated to increase the feelings of adhesion and respect to the Supreme Pontiff, which are essential among Catholics; and when the people saw such figures as Isabella and Ferdinand stubbornly clinging to what they deemed to be their royal prerogatives, they sided with their kings, and the ties of submission to the Holy See were severely shaken.

The situation became worse some years later, when the sceptre of Spain fell into the hands of the young Flemish Prince who was afterwards the powerful Emperor Charles V. Well known to all are the troubles which he caused the Church in the early part of his reign, as is his decided hostility against Leo X., before this great Pope, who hesitated a long time between assisting the Emperor or his rival, Francis I. of France, or keeping neutral, concluded to ally himself with the Emperor to eject the French from

Italy. There was even a moment in which the cunningness of Spanish diplomacy, alert and nearly all-powerful at all times, attempted to use Luther as a weapon against the Pope. Don Juan Manuel, the Spanish Ambassador at the Court of Leo X., suggested to the Emperor to take advantage of "a certain Fray Martin Luther, who preaches and publishes a great many things against the Pontifical power, and who is said to be a great scholar, and certainly has given much trouble to the Pope, and harasses him much more than he desires."[1] It was not necessary, however, to resort to such means, and the idea was abandoned.

Independent of the facilities which political agitation against Rome afforded for the spread of Lutheranism, there was also the excitement which the writings of Erasmus, reprinted both in Latin and in Spanish, created in Spain. Those writings, the spirit which they caused to prevail for some time at least, and even the very same controversy to which they gave origin, paved the way for the introduction of the new doctrines, and prepared for their acceptance the minds of the people.

Spanish Protestantism, nevertheless, was not born in Spain. The first Spaniards who became Protestants embraced the new faith while abroad, and abroad they remained until the end. They were all men of note, scholars of distinction, students in the universities of Louvain or in France, or others, who became contaminated and wrote against the Church while away from Spain.

The first one to be mentioned among the Spanish Protestants is the famous and elegant writer, Juan de Valdes, who died in Italy in 1541, and who had been in correspondence with Erasmus since 1528. Valdes began by writing humorously and sarcastically against Rome and the Roman Church, the principal of his works of this kind being a "Dialogue Between Mercury and Caro." He adopted afterwards many of the tenets of Luther, and ended by starting a kind of mysticism of his own, more or less antitrinitarian. His followers, called *Valdesianos*, after his own name, formed a kind of secret society, which lasted a short time in Italy, and which Lutherans themselves looked upon with no favor. He was the first who translated directly from the Greek into the Spanish language a portion of the New Testament.

The second place in the list belongs to Juan Diaz, born in Cuença, but a student in the University of Paris, who became a Lutheran in 1539 or 1540, and whose principal work, written in Latin, was the "Christianæ Religionis Summa," a kind of catechism strictly Lutheran. He was killed in Germany by one of his brother's servants, who split his skull with an axe.

[1] Dispatch of 1520 preserved in the Salazar collection (Academy of History), cited by Menendez Pelayo.

Immediately after these two "Reformers," the two brothers, Jaime and Francisco de Encinas, must be mentioned. Both of them were born in Burgos, and studied in Paris and in the Netherlands. Jaime de Encinas published in Antwerp, in the Spanish language, in 1541, a Spanish Catechism, and died in Italy under circumstances which are scarcely known. Some say that he was tried and condemned to death in Rome, but the fact is denied by others, the truth being that almost nothing is known about him or his trial and condemnation.[1] The other brother, Francisco de Encinas, born in 1520, was a man of much more prominence on account of his learning and superior scholarship. He went to Wittenberg for the purpose of becoming personally acquainted with Melanchthon, by whose advice he translated from the Greek into the Spanish the New Testament, which he printed in Antwerp in 1543.[2] He wrote his "Memoirs," and many other books, among them one in Spanish entitled "Antithesis Between Paul the Apostle, of Tarsis, and the Modern Paul (Paul III.), a Roman Pirate." He was imprisoned for a time in Brussels, but succeeded in escaping from the jail. He died in Geneva in 1552, a victim of an epidemic then prevailing in that city.

Francisco de San Roman, also a native of Burgos, who also became a Protestant while in the Netherlands, began his career as a propagandist of the new doctrines in 1540. He was soon noticed by the violence of his language and by the furious and blind fanaticism which he displayed. He went so far as to present himself at Ratisbonne; and there before the Diet, and in the presence of the Emperor, he made a long speech to prove that true religion was

[1] Balmez, among many others, is positive about the fact that the Roman Inquisition never caused any one to be put to death. (See "Protestantism and Catholicity Compared," etc., chapter xxxvi.) "It is a remarkable thing," he says, "that the Roman Inquisition was never known to pronounce the execution of capital punishment." The references in regard to Jaime de Encinas come from Protestant writers.

[2] Encinas, being anxious to dedicate his book to Charles V., appeared before him and set forth his request. "What book do you wish to dedicate to me?" asked the Emperor. "Sire," answered Encinas, "that part of the Holy Scripture which we call the New Testament, faithfully translated by me into Spanish. Specially is to be found in it the Evangelic History and the Letters of the Apostles. I have desired that Your Majesty, as defender of religion, should examine and judge this work; and I humbly pray that after it is approved, the work should be recommended by your Imperial authority to the Christian world." "Are you," the Emperor replied, "the author of that work?" "The author is the Holy Ghost; inspired by Him, some holy men wrote in Greek, for common information, these oracles of salvation and redemption. I am only His faithful servant and feeble organ, who translated the work into Spanish." "In Spanish?" inquired the Emperor. "Yes, Sire, in our Spanish language; and I pray Your Majesty to be its patron and defender, according to your mercy." "Be it as you say," answered the Emperor, "provided there is nothing suspicious in the book." The translation was then referred to the proper authorities for examination. (Menendez Pelayo, "Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles," vol. ii., p. 230.)

only to be found among Protestants, and that the Emperor would do right in ordering Protestantism to be the religion of all his dominions, or at least leaving the Germans in peace, and allowing them to embrace the "Reformation." Francisco de Encinas had made strenuous efforts to prevent him from "preaching without legitimate authority," but San Roman did not pay any attention to this good advice of his countryman. It is said that Charles V. listened to him with patience, and even found some amusement in his sermon; and that he dismissed the "Reformer" with the promise that due consideration should be given to all he had said. Twice more he appeared before the Emperor and urged the same suggestion, that Protestantism should be made the religion of the empire and also of Spain; but the fourth time that he attempted to get into the Emperor's rooms and address him he was arrested by the guards. These, who happened to be Spaniards, wanted to dispose summarily of the preacher by throwing him into the Danube, but they were persuaded to allow him to be taken to Spain to be tried. He denied free will and the merits of good works; he spoke bitterly against confession and indulgences, purgatory, the adoration of the Cross, the invocation of saints, and the veneration of images. He was condemned to death and was burned alive in Valladolid, then the capital of Spain.

Pedro Nuñez de Vela, a native of Avila, who was Professor of Greek in Lausanne, became a Protestant and published several books in Latin, among them one entitled "De Ratione Interpretandi Aliorum Scripta." He enjoyed a great reputation as a Greek scholar, and seems never to have been disturbed or persecuted in any way, either for his religious ideas or anything else.

Here comes the place for Miguel Servedo, born in 1511 in the city of Tudela in Navarre, a great physician and a writer of considerable ability and information. His quarrel with Calvin, of whom he had been at first a great friend, or with whom, at least, he had been almost always, is too well known to be repeated here. The fact is that Calvin caused him to be arrested in Geneva on the 13th of August, 1553, and that he was condemned to death and burned alive on the 26th of October of the same year. The sentence pronounced by the "Syndics and judges for criminal cases in the city of Geneva," reads: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, we, by this our final sentence, given now by us in writing, do condemn you, Miguel Servedo, to be bound and taken from here to Champel, where you will be tied to a stake and burned alive, together with your books, both printed and manuscript, until your body is completely reduced to ashes; and so you will end your life to be an example for all those who should attempt to commit your crime."

Alfonso Lingurio, a disciple of Miguel Servedo, wrote a book, or, we should rather say, five books, against "the commonly admitted doctrine of the Trinity." This book is known only by references made to it by bibliographical writers. No further mention can be made of this "reformer," whom some suppose to have been a Pole instead of a Spaniard.

The first Spanish Protestant who became such in Spain was Doctor Don Agustin Cazalla, a Canon in the Cathedral of Valladolid. He was born in 1510, and his aspiration was to do in Spain what Luther had done in Germany. He was a man of great eloquence, and had been appointed "preacher to the Emperor"; but he was disappointed at not having been treated or rewarded as he thought he deserved. He succeeded, with the aid of some women, among whom there were five or six Carmelite nuns, in establishing what was called the "Lutheran *Conciliabulo*," which was the first Spanish Protestant congregation ever seen in Spain.

Whether their tenets were truly Protestant, and not wild doctrines that Protestants themselves would not have failed to visit with severe punishment, is a matter which has never been clearly elucidated. The author of the "Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles the Fifth," certainly not an impartial writer when referring to the Catholic Church, the learned William Stirling, says that the opinions of these *so-called Spanish Protestants* "can hardly be made clear to us, since they were not clear to themselves," and that "Protestant divines have assumed that these tenets were Protestant on account of the vengeance with which they were pursued."[1]

The *Conciliabulo* was discovered, and those of its members who could be found and arrested were handed over to the Inquisition. The first person imprisoned was Doctor Cazalla, who was soon followed by a nobleman named Don Carlos de Seso, Fray Domingo de Rojas, of the order of St. Dominic, several priests and nuns, and other persons. Their trial ended by the two *autos da fe* which took place on the 21st of May and the 8th of October, 1559, and has been a fruitful theme for the enemies of the Church when abusing her doctrines. Only three persons, however, so it must be said in honor of the truth, perished then by the flames. They were the Licenciate Herrezuelo, burned alive on the first; and Don Carlos de Seso and Juan Sanchez, who suffered the same death on the second. And the chroniclers of the times, as well as the official records, agree that those unfortunate men showed themselves so defiant and abusive in their language that it was necessary to gag them in order to stop their blasphemies.

Stirling calls them "recruits of reform, raw, wavering, doubting,

[1] Stirling, "Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles the Fifth," chapter viii.

without any clear common principle or habits of combination;"[1] and the fact is that they excited no sympathy among the people and accomplished nothing.

Certain writers have mentioned in this place, to which he belongs chronologically, among the Spanish Protestants, the famous and most learned, as well as virtuous, Fray Bartolomé de Carranza, Archbishop of Toledo, whose celebrated trial, which lasted seventeen years, gave occasion also to so many criticisms of all kinds. But this unfortunate prelate cannot properly be included in the list. True it is that Pope Gregory XIII., by his decision rendered on the 14th of April, 1576, condemned sixteen propositions picked out from his writings, and declared that said propositions raised *vehement suspicions;* that he had "absorbed bad doctrine from several condemned heretics, as Martin Luther, Œcolampadius, and Philip Melanchthon;" but it is true also that he abjured and took back whatever was contained or meant in the sixteen objectionable propositions; and, above all, that subsequently to that abjuration, and on the very day on which he died, previous to his receiving the last sacraments, freely and spontaneously, in the presence of several persons, whom he summoned to his death-bed, he made in Latin a solemn protestation of his Catholic faith.

Lutheranism, which completely disappeared from Valladolid, sprang up in Seville in 1540. A nobleman of that city named Rodrigo de Valer, who had succeeded in learning by heart almost the whole of the Bible, ended by believing himself to be inspired by the spirit of God, and to have been sent to the world as a messenger of Christ for dispelling the darkness of error and correcting the sinful and adulterous generation of his time. The Inquisition, into whose hands he fell, treated him at first as insane, and allowed him to go free; but he, having persisted in his "mission," and continuing to interrupt the sermons and contradict the preachers while in the pulpit, causing considerable scandal, was arrested again and locked up in the monastery of Our Lady at San Lúcar de Barrameda, where he died of disease.

Don Juan Gil, *Egidius*, as he called himself, Latinizing his name, was also a native of Seville, in whose celebrated Cathedral he was a canon. His standing in the Church was high enough to cause Charles V. to nominate him in 1550 for the episcopal see of Tortosa. Twenty-five propositions maintained by him in his writings and in his sermons were adjudged to be heretical, and out of them he abjured ten, retracted eight, and satisfactorily explained seven. After one year of imprisonment he was set free, and continued to reside in Seville, where he died.

---

[1] Stirling, "Cloister Life," etc., chapter viii.

Don Constantino Ponce de la Fuente, a Doctor of Theology and a celebrated preacher in Seville, for a certain time the chaplain of Charles V., with whom he traveled through Germany and the Netherlands, and the author of several books which in his age excited considerable attention, must be given the next place in the Spanish Protestant catalogue. One of his books, never published, "On the State of the Church," etc., always refers to the Pope as Antichrist, and speaks of Purgatory as being a "scare-crow invented by the friars to get a living." His trial ended with a sentence of imprisonment in the fortress at Triana, where, after two years of confinement, he died. Some writers have said that he killed himself by swallowing some pieces of glass, but most of them believe that he died broken down by sadness and disease. The Emperor used to say: "If Constantino is a heretic, he must be a very great one."

Julian Hernandez, whom the Protestant writers mention in this place, was more a book-smuggler than a Protestant. His principal work was to introduce into Seville Protestant printed copies in Spanish of the New Testament, and aid in this respect the Protestant propaganda.

Strange to say, the stronghold of Lutheran doctrines in Seville was found to be the Convent of San Isidro, whose friars belonged to the order of St. Jerome, and occupied a picturesque location near the ruins of ancient Italica. Besides those friars, one of whom became more conspicuous than the others for his denial of the virginity of Our Blessed Lady, there was also a lady, Doña Isabel Baena, in whose home, in the city of Seville, "the faithful met to hear the word of God."

The writers of the time called this "the Lutheran *conspiracy;*" and it was discovered by a woman who attended the meetings and became informer. The whole thing was then broken up, and after the display of severity which the Inquisition made with six of the friars and with some other persons,[1] on September 24th, 1559, and December 22d, 1560, nothing more was heard in Seville about Luther or Lutheranism.

Outside these two "Churches" (Valladolid and Seville), no Spanish Protestant can be found in Spain in the sixteenth century. Those found occasionally in Aragon and other provinces either were foreigners temporarily residing in Spanish territory, or were not Protestants in the proper sense of the word. Not one of them was able to leave behind him any lasting trace of his existence.

The sixteenth century passed away and carried with it to the grave the two men whom the Protestant movement always deemed to be its most decided opponents. Charles V. and Philip II. dis-

[1] Menendez Pelayo, "Historia," etc., vol. ii., p. 447, *et seq.*

appeared from the stage of life, and Protestantism in Spain could have breathed with more freedom if it ever had had there any chance of existence. In the seventeenth century, says Menendez Pelayo, a Protestant in Spain was a *rara avis in terra.* In reality only one of this time can be remembered, and he more for the fanaticism of his zeal than for his doctrines or his writings. He was an ex-Franciscan friar named Ferrer, who embraced Calvinism and allowed himself to be carried to the greatest excesses. On one occasion, for instance, he, having entered a church at the time that a priest was saying Mass and pronouncing the words of consecration, rushed to the altar, and, tearing through the kneeling people, snatched from the celebrant's hands the consecrated Host and broke it to pieces. He was burned alive in Madrid on the 21st of January, 1624.

Spanish Protestantism in this period did show, however, some signs of existence outside of Spain. The names of Juan Perez de Pineda, Casiodoro de Reina, Reinaldo Gonzalez Montano, Antonio del Corro, Cipriano de Valera, Adrian Saravia, Juan Nicolas Sacharles, Fernando de Tejera, and a few others, among them an ex-member of the Society of Jesus named Mena, can be mentioned with those who endeavored from abroad, by their writings, to propagate Protestant doctrines in their native country.

Perez de Pineda, who translated the New Testament and the Psalms, and wrote a Catechism and other works, lived in Geneva and died in Paris.

Casiodoro de Reina, who had been a friar, became in London one of the spies of Queen Elizabeth (1563), from whom he received a pension of sixty pounds. He tried to establish a Protestant Spanish Chapel in London, and was given a home, where he preached in Spanish three times a week; but the attempt was a failure. He translated the Bible into the Spanish language, and caused 2600 copies of this translation to be printed at Basilea. He died in Antwerp.

Gonzalez Montano wrote in Latin a curious book, which was printed at Heidelberg, whose first part contains severe criticisms against the Spanish Inquisition, while the second is an encomiastic history of the Lutheran congregation of Seville. Nothing is known about this writer, and the opinion prevails that the name Gonzalez Montano is only a *nom de plume.*

Antonio del Corro, an ex-friar of the order of St. Jerome, who had fled from Seville with eleven of his companions in 1557, was first a zealous Calvinist and then a member of the Church of England. He wrote in French a "Letter to the King of Spain," which was printed in 1567. When last heard of he was residing in Oxford.

Cipriano de Valera, called by way of eminence "the heretical Spaniard," was one of the Sevillian fugitive monks who went to London. There he married, and published in Spanish a "Treatise on the Pope and the Mass," which is said to remind one of the writings of Voltaire. He also translated and published in 1597, in Spanish, the Catechism, or "Institutes," of Calvin, and a book of William Perkin, entitled "The Reformed Catholic." He made also a new edition of the Bible in Spanish, with annotations, and was the author of a great many controversial pamphlets or tracts. When last heard of, in 1602, he was in Amsterdam with his wife.

Saravia, who was probably a Belgian, the son of Spanish parents, became "a clergyman of the Anglican Church," and the author of several books. Most of his time he lived in England, where he was a champion of the royal authority.

Juan Nicolas Sacharles was the author of a book entitled "The Reformed Spaniard," printed simultaneously in English and in Latin. In it he explained why he had left his church. It is thought that the name Juan Nicolas Sacharles is not a real one, but a pseudonym.

Fernando de Tejera was another friar, who went to England, where he married and had two daughters. In one of his works he explained the reasons which induced him to apostatize. Another book of his, called "El Carrascon," is a satirical work against several religious subjects.

Melchior Roman, an ex-Dominican friar, who publicly abjured his religion in 1600, resided the greatest part of his life in France.

Fray Gabriel de Montealegre, a friar of the Carthusian community, wrote a book entitled "Martinus Lutherus Vindicatus," which has not been printed. He usually resided in Wurtemberg.

Jaime Salgredo, another apostate friar, who had fled to France, abjured there the Catholic religion in 1666, and published several small books and translations of minor importance.

The ex-Jesuit, Mena, is said to have joined in Geneva a Protestant congregation.[1]

When the eighteenth century came, with all its work of demolition and anti-Christian doctrines, not less prevalent in Spain than elsewhere, Protestantism continued to make there the poorest show. The religious atmosphere of the Spanish peninsula, infested as it was by Judaism, and Jansenism, and regalism, and rationalism, and indifferentism, did not allow, however, any recognized form of Protestantism to develop itself into anything like a lasting manifestation of human thought. As Menendez Pelayo remarks: "Only as bibliographical curiosities can we cite the

[1] Menendez Pelayo, "Historia," etc., vol. ii., p. 513.

works of the few very far from conspicuous Spaniards who during this period embraced the doctrines of the Reformation."

These few Spaniards, in most cases, had been driven from Spain by political convulsions, and had emigrated either to England or to Germany, where they gave expression to their religious views. At such a distance from Spain, and lacking genius, or any extraordinary powers, it was impossible for them to revolutionize their country.

The first one to be named was Don Antonio Gavin, a clergyman, born in Aragon, who, on the third of January, 1716, publicly abjured in London the Catholic faith, and joined the Church of England, from which he received the necessary authority to preach, and conduct the services at a chapel which had been established in that metropolis by a small congregation of Spanish refugees, most of them belonging to the army, and thrown there by "the war of the succession." Shortly afterwards he preached at the Queen's Chapel at Westminster, and then he was appointed to be the chaplain of a British man-of-war named "The Preston." Subsequently to this, he was made pastor of a church at Gowran, in Ireland, whence he was removed to another church in Cork. While in the latter place he wrote, in English, a voluminous book (three volumes), to which he gave the title of "A Master-key to Popery," printed in 1725 (this is the date of the second edition), and which he dedicated to the Prince of Wales and to Lord Carteret.

This work is a collection of criticisms, written in most undignified and disgusting language, with innumerable anecdotes of bad taste, generally obscene, against auricular confession, indulgences, the Mass, the veneration of images and relics, and kindred subjects, to which are added the "Lives of the Popes," and also the "Lives and Abominable Intrigues of many Clergymen and Friars of the Roman Church."

It is related that five thousand copies of this work were sold at once, and that a French translation of the same, made in 1727 by one Mr. Janson, was also exhausted.

The book, however, had no influence in Spain.

The second Spanish Protestant of the eighteenth century was Don Sebastian de la Encina, of whom nothing remains except a nice edition, made by him, in Amsterdam, Holland, of the New Testament. The title-page of this book, printed in Spanish, informs us that Encina was a minister of the Church of England, and preacher for a congregation of Dutch merchants having business in Spain. This book, printed in 1718, is preceded by a preface and an index or explanatory note, setting forth the contents of the book, and the order in which its different parts should be placed or considered.

The third and last Spanish Protestant, worthy to be remembered at all, among those belonging to this age, was Don Felix Antonio de Alvarado, who emigrated from Spain and went to London, where he settled. He called himself a "Presbyter of the Anglican Church and the Chaplain of the Honorable English merchants doing business with Spain." All that he wrote was written in Spanish, and it seems that, besides his religious duties, he was engaged in the teaching of his own language, for which purpose he wrote and published a "Method," and also a collection of dialogues. He translated into Spanish the English "Book of Common Prayer," and also the "Apology of the True Christian Theology" of Robert Barclay.

The nineteenth century, constantly spoken of and recognized as the century of light, of liberty, of civilization in every respect, has not proved, however, to be more favorable than the preceding ones for the propagation of Protestant ideas in Spain. The fruits it has given are neither better nor more abundant than those formerly obtained.

The first place among the Spanish Protestants of this century belongs, by right, both chronologically and otherwise, to Don José Maria Blanco, a secular priest of Seville, ordained in 1800, who emigrated from Spain to England, and settled in London in 1809. He there, little by little, became estranged from the Catholic faith, and ended in 1826 by joining the Church of England, in whose service he remained for some time. In 1833 he left that church and became a Unitarian, and, according to the common opinion, he was merely a Deist in the last days of his existence. He died near Liverpool in 1841.

This Spaniard, better known in the world of letters under the name of "Blanco White," and also "Leocadio Doblado," or twice white, which he adopted to sign his writings, was the author of a considerable number of works, from letters and magazine articles to serious books, which excited in his time great attention. He may be said to have been, in reality, the only Spaniard who, outside of the Catholic Church, has exercised any influence at all in the religious movement of the world.

Next to him, although of exceedingly less importance, the name must be mentioned of Don José Muñoz de Sotomayor, also a secular priest, who emigrated from Spain to France, where he became a Protestant and got married. His principal works, if not the only ones, were translations made by him into the Spanish. He called himself "a Presbyter of the Anglican Church, a Doctor of Theology, and a member of several academies of Europe." His best known translations are the one of the "Real Perspective of Prac-

tical Christianity," by Wilberforce, and the one of the "Essay on the Divine Authority of the New Testament," by Bogue.

Then comes Don Juan Calderon, an ex-friar of the Order of Saint Francis, who emigrated from Spain in 1823, and after passing through different vicissitudes, became a Protestant, and succeeded in gathering a Spanish congregation in London, in 1829 and 1830. He got married, traveled a good deal as an agent of the "London Continental Society," and wrote several books, some of them on ecclesiastical subjects, and others merely grammatical. From 1849 to 1854 he was the editor of two periodicals, one succeeding the other, both of them published in London, and in Spanish, under the titles of *El Catolicismo neto* (Pure Catholicism), and *El Examen Libre* (Free Examination).

Ramon Montsalvage, whose life has been published by the London Religious Tract Society, is thought by many to have been a fictitious individual who never existed. His biographer says, however, that he was born in Catalonia in 1819, and was a Capuchin friar at the time of the suppression of the religious orders in 1835; that he went to France, and that there, at Besançon, he became a Protestant; that he traveled as an agent of the Geneva Evangelical Society; that, in 1842, he was in Madrid, engaged in missionary work, and that from there he came to America; and nothing more has been heard about him.

Don Lorenzo de Lucena, a secular priest, who had been the President of the Seminary of Cordova, went away from that city, first to Gibraltar, where he became a Protestant and married, and then to England, where he placed himself at the service of the London Biblical Society, and made and published several translations from English into Spanish.

Don Luis de Usoz was a Quaker, the only Spanish Quaker on record; but he devoted his fortune and almost his whole life to promote Protestantism in Spain. He was born in 1806 and was a great scholar and antiquarian. He furnished money abundantly for the printing of almost all the Protestant books which appeared in his time in Spanish, and he himself made a translation directly from the Hebrew of the Prophecy of Isaiah. At the time of his death he was engaged in writing a history of the "Reformation" in Spain, of which he left one chapter already finished, and the materials for the others more or less ready and arranged for immediate use.

Here, properly, it might be said, that the end is reached of the Protestant movement in Spain. Ferdinand VII. died, and his daughter Isabella II. was called to the throne. The convulsions of all kinds through which Spain has passed, are known to all. The most disgusting spectacles have been witnessed, and license and anarchy,

revolution and schism have prevailed on occasions. Mention has been made of the massacres of priests in 1834,[1] of the suppression of the religious orders, of the confiscation of their property, of the so-called reforms of worship and the clergy, the rejection of the *Syllabus*, the protracted quarrels with the Holy See on matters exclusively ecclesiastical, the constitutional provisions in relation to the freedom of worship. These and many other things of the same kind are only specimens picked out here and there, from which it may be inferred what kind of agitation has been carried on. During the last Republic, from 1873 to 1875, many other things still more wonderful have been witnessed. Don Emilio Castelar, of whom it has become fashionable to speak with praise in this country, probably because his speeches cannot well be translated, has declared that liberty and faith were incompatible with each other, and that he has decided to adhere to liberty. And Don Leandro Suñer de Capdevila, who was Secretary of State, and a physician by profession, declared that he had three enemies, whom he was constantly fighting, these enemies being "monarchy, consumption, and God." With these elements Protestantism might have found some chance to penetrate into Spain, and bring forth some fruit. The attempt has been made; but up to date it has proved to be abortive.

There have been, and there are now, here and there in Spain and the Spanish countries, a few foreign missionaries and propagandists, and occasionally an extremely rare Spaniard by birth or by race, attempting to build up either a Methodist, or a Baptist, or an Episcopal congregation. Sometimes their efforts have been helped by foreign diplomatic action whenever popular demonstrations against their preachers, or custom house troubles in regard to the introduction of the bibles, hymn-books and tracts, afforded some opportunity for its interposition. Sometimes the foreign intervention has been more indirect, but not less conducive to the same ultimate result.[2] But no success of any account has as yet been accomplished.

---

[1] On the 17th of July, 1834, sixteen Jesuit Fathers were assassinated in Madrid, and their bodies dragged through the streets with great noise and rejoicing. Sixty more Jesuits who had sheltered themselves in their own chapel, and were there in prayer preparing themselves for departing this life, were found there by an armed band, the leader of which penetrated, sword in hand, into the sacred place. Fortunately, one of those sixty priests was Father Muñoz, a brother of the Duke of Rianzares, the husband of Queen Christina (whom she had married secretly); he refused to accept the life which was offered him on that account, and insisted on following the same fate as the others. This saved the whole number. The leader did not allow any one to touch Father Muñoz, nor any other of his fifty-nine companions, and left a guard for their protection. Dominicans, Franciscans and Fathers of Our Lady of Mercy were murdered in great numbers.

[2] See, for instance, "Papers relating to the foreign affairs of the United States," in 1873, page 667, note of Mr. Nelson to Mr. Fish, April 26, 1873, and the inclosures

The attempt in that direction which in modern times has been accompanied with results of sufficient importance to seriously attract the attention of the Church authorities, was the one made at Gibraltar between 1832 and 1835; and that, properly, did not take place in Spain. A large portion of the population of Gibraltar is Catholic, and the London Wesleyan Society undertook to convert it and make it Methodist. A man of great ability, of the name of Dr. William N. Rule, who in a short time succeeded in mastering the Spanish language, was sent there by that society; and he, besides his preaching, and prayer-meetings, and revivals, and other missionary efforts, established a school where children of all classes were educated gratuitously. He gained thereby great popularity. When the Vicar-General became acquainted with the movement and saw what it would lead to, he took a step which broke it up at once. He established in 1835, under the auspices of the Congregation of the Propaganda, and the assistance of some prominent Catholics of the locality, public orthodox gratuitous schools which were crowded by children, and the work of Dr. Rule fell to the ground.

Perhaps, after all, the failure of Protestantism in Spain and the Spanish countries is much less to be wondered at than its success in other countries. The wonder is in reality that a doctrine like Protestantism, whose fundamental principle has been recognized at all times as a sure germ of destruction,[1] could succeed, nevertheless, in keeping itself alive for nearly four centuries, and resisting the slow but unfailing work of disintegration which undermines its existence. That is the thing to be admired, and the curious problem to be studied. Even writers as full of prejudice against Catholics as Stirling, have to acknowledge that nowhere in the world has the triumph of Protestantism been complete, and that the Catholic germs left there are unceasingly coming up and gaining ground and strength. "The Protestant must confess," Stirling says, "that the new religion never succeeded in eradicating the old, even amongst the freest and the boldest of the Teutonic peoples."[2]

---

relative to the presentation to the President of Mexico by the Minister of the United States of "six Protestant missionaries," and the "earnest and energetic reply which was completely satisfactory to the gentlemen in question," assuring them protection.

See, also, in the same official "Papers" for 1874, the congratulations sent by Mr. Fish to the Mexican Government on October 22d, 1873, for "the great step in advance" taken by Mexico in declaring marriage to be merely a civil contract, in forbidding religious institutions to acquire real estate, in abolishing religious oaths, etc., page 715.

[1] Cicero had recognized among many other religious truths which do honor to his great, noble mind, that if in matters of religion permission should be given to each man to pass opinions and to interpret the Commandments, the confusion of chaos would soon be the consequence.

[2] Stirling, "The Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles V.," chapter viii.

The interesting investigation, if ever made, into the causes which enabled Protestantism to smother, for the time being, the Catholic elements, always living and imperishable, which at the time of its appearance prevailed everywhere without opposition, and which constantly and uninterruptedly are coming back to the surface and disrupting the new faith, may be helped considerably by looking with attention to the United States. In Europe, where emperors, and kings, and princes, calling themselves "protectors" of the Church, and "the arm of Rome," and "the sword of heretics," engaged themselves in persecution, and mingled religious tenets with political ideas, and combined with each other in "Holy Alliances," Protestantism, in some form or other, has been taken in general as a sign of emancipation, and has established itself upon grounds of apparent permanency. While here, in the United States, where there are no kings or princes, where religion does not enter into politics, except to purify their purposes and their means of action, and where liberty allows everything to be tried on its merits, the fate of Protestantism seems to be sealed.

One hundred years ago (1775) the Puritans of Massachusetts expelled from their territory a Catholic colony. Now, in 1887, the capital of that territory has within its limits a greater number of Catholic churches than of any other denomination. One hundred years ago, in 1776, there was not one Bishop in the United States and no more than twenty-five priests for a Catholic population of 25,000 souls. And last year we had seventy-five dioceses and 7658 priests for a Catholic population of 7,000,000 of souls. One hundred years ago there was scarcely a Catholic, except in certain localities, who was not a foreigner and belonging to the less favored classes of society; and now "there is scarcely an American family distinguished either by its ancestry, or by its social position, or by its wealth, which has not one or more representatives among the converts to the Catholic Church."[1]

As Father Hecker says, the person who sees the hand of Divine Providence leading the acts of man through history, does not fail to see in the same way that the Catholic Church is the body organized by Our Lord to guard and teach the truth, "will recognize that the Republic and the Catholic Church, under the same divine guidance, are working together in the United States, forming the various races of men and nationalities into a homogeneous people, and by their united action giving a bright promise of a higher development of men than has been heretofore accomplished."[2]

Thanks to liberty, the United States of the future will be as grand

[1] "The Catholic Church in the United States," by Rev. I. T. Hecker.

[2] Ibid.

in art, in science and in literature, as now it is grand in wealth, and in inventive powers, and in business enterprise; and in the same way as now in our days the Episcopalian and the Unitarian, the nearest to the Church and the farthest from it, both of them exceedingly enlightened and intellectual, furnish to our Church the largest contingent of converts, so, with the grace of God, the near future will witness the unification of religious creeds and the proclamation, under the flag of liberty, of no other faith than the Catholic.

"The future of the United States," Father Hecker says again, "belongs under God to that religion which by its conscious possession of truth and by the indwelling spirit of Divine love shall succeed in bringing the American people to unity in their religious belief and action, as they are actually one in the political sense."

Here Protestantism is doomed to die, and will die sooner than in Europe. But in Spain and the Spanish countries it cannot live for a day, and as soon as it appears it fades away with discredit.

SCIENCE OR BUMBLEPUPPY?

THERE appeared some years ago a clever little book entitled "Whist or Bumblepuppy?" which is at once an excellent guide for the study of whist, and an admirable satire on much that passes for it. The author defines Bumblepuppy as "persisting to play whist, either in utter ignorance of all its known principles, or in defiance of them, or both." He adds that Hudibras has given another definition:

> "A liberal art, that cost no pains
> Of study, industry, or brains."

A few illustrations may make the point clearer. The whist player begins his education in the craft by learning the leads and the usual way of playing the important cards for each hand. He learns the principles of the game, and at play endeavors to put them into practice. He begins by remembering his own hand, and, keeping his eyes on the table, watches the fall of the cards, noting who has played each. The professor of bumblepuppy troubles himself about none of these things. He is an agnostic as to whether there is a principle of the game or not. In the course of years he gets a misty idea of rules he should have learned in two

hours' study. He never remembers his own hand because he can always look at it, and because he looks at it he never knows who has played any particular card. It will be readily conceived that the species and varieties of the great genus of bumblepuppists can hardly be counted. We shall allude to only one or two of them. There is the player who is so taken with some particular "coup" that he thinks the game well lost if he can only make it come off. To play so as to deceive some one is to many a *summum bonum*, and if the one happens to be the partner they look on it as the chance of war. To these an obscure play is almost the same as a good one. That we may not be too severe on the players of bumblepuppy, we will add that there are some who could easily become masters of the game, and, that, on the other hand, there are conscientious whist players whose minds are too limited to know when to disregard rule. As our author observes, "between the worst whist and the best bumblepuppy it is almost impossible to draw the line."

We are convinced that there is a vast deal of bumblepuppy in the world, pervading wider and loftier spheres than the card room, but, *mutatis mutandis*, its characteristics are the same. Chief among these is the contempt of first principles which are not acquired without study, and which do not add to, but may even interfere with, the brilliancy of the game. Another very common one is a predilection for pyrotechnics. Strict reasoning is conspicuous by its absence; for, besides being difficult, it destroys many pleasing effects and unexpected transformations.

We forbear to allude to the spread of bumblepuppy in the various walks of life. The subject is too vast. We shall confine ourselves to its invasion of the realms of sciences. Here, as in whist, there is no difficulty in recognizing a typical specimen, but it occasionally happens that the bumblepuppist resembles the man of science so closely that for a time he escapes detection. Thus there are many whose powers of observation are so excellent and well-trained that till they leave facts and take up theories, their bumblepuppy is unsuspected. Again there are those of rare gifts who bow before a prevailing fashion, pretending a belief they do not have in the theories of the day, and leave the paths of sound thought for the pleasant mazes of so-called popular science. These, also, have their representative at the card table. We can imagine a whist player away from his peers who finds a grim amusement in adapting his game to the prevailing bumblepuppy; but, we think, his self-respect must suffer by the operation.

The following is not a bad specimen of bumblepuppy taken from a newspaper. "Stage fright has from the dawn of experience among actors been looked upon as an affliction common to men

and women of finer mould. It has nothing to do with the moral qualities, but is caused by the reflected magnetism of a multitude of spirits thrown suddenly upon one person, who is already in an excited mental condition." Here is quite a mine of information. In the first place, we see that the moral qualities have no connection with the fineness of the mould, which is a little surprising. But the gem is in the second sentence. Stage fright is caused by "the reflected magnetism of a multitude of spirits," etc. Now, if it were only magnetism it would be sufficiently peculiar, for it is generally taught that magnetism is in matter, and not in spirit; but what makes it more complicated is that it is reflected magnetism. That is to say, it does not strike directly, but rebounds on to the devoted actor from something or somebody else. But why is it magnetism at all? The magnet attracts, but in stage fright there is rather a tendency to run away. Above all, where did the spirits get the magnetism to be reflected?

We may be asked, why take so much trouble to demolish this little piece of harmless absurdity? Is it not "breaking a butterfly upon the wheel?" We do so for two reasons; first to give an example of twaddle which, transparent as it is, would, we fear, not be recognized as such by a multitude of readers; and secondly to show that, however weak and silly it may be, it is not worse than that which appears, in two very pretentious papers, in a leading English review, the *Fortnightly*. The June number consists almost wholly of papers written in honor of the Queen's Jubilee. The two to which we refer are "The Progress of Science from 1836 to 1886," by Grant Allen, and "The Progress of Thought in Our Time," by J. Addington Symonds. Two better examples of the most offensively arrogant bumblepuppy would not easily be found.

Mr. Grant Allen begins with a shout of triumph. "Fifty years ago science was still inchoate. Much had been done by early pioneers. The ground had been cleared, the building materials had been in part provided, the foundations had been duly and ably laid, but the superstructure as yet had hardly been raised a poor foot or two above the original level." After this gratifying tribute to the labors of our predecessors, he points out that the building of a compact harmonious whole has been reserved for the last fifty years. "Ours has been an age of firm grasp and wide vision." We presume that the next sentence, announcing the "downfall of anthropocentric fallacy" is meant as a confirmation of this statement. But what is this fallacy? According to Catholic science God, not man, is the centre of all things. Moreover, though Mr. Allen may not know it, it is against this very idea that his system of so-called science is directed. After a glance at geology we come, as might be expected, to evolution, and rush *in medias res* at

once. Evolution is "the acknowledged mainspring of all living and active contemporaneous science." Evolution is here used in its widest sense. That it has had an immense influence on nearly every science, and has profoundly modified the thought of the century, is beyond question. It is, we think, none the less unjustifiable to speak of it as the mainspring which implies, or should imply, something beyond question. Mr. Allen says truly that "evolution is not synonymous with Darwinism. The whole immensely exceeds the part. Darwinism forms but a small chapter in the history of a far vaster and more comprehensive movement of the human mind." But it is a great and gratuitous assumption to speak of Darwinism as synonymous with the theory of the evolution of plants and animals. There are two great evolutionary theories, to say nothing of numerous modifications of them, which differ very widely from each other. One of these is Darwinism proper, of which essential parts are a tendency to variation, gradual changes from external causes, sexual selection, and the inheritance of acquired peculiarities. This is the more popular theory, but it is most inaccurate to pretend that it is the only one, or it has the support of all the strongest evolutionists. Eminent anatomists, such as Mivart[1] in England, and Kölliker in Germany, believe in evolution by sudden leaps due to internal causes. The latter, in a recent address at Leipsic, before the German Anatomical Society, admitted frankly that neither theory is established. Anatomists hesitate, but Mr. Allen is certain.

The following passage supports our statement that Mr. Allen's evolution is distinctly atheistic: "As in the cosmos, so in the solar system itself, evolutionism has taught us to regard our sun, with its attendant planets, and their ancillary satellites, all in their several orbits, as owing their shape, size, relations and movements, not to external design and deliberate creation, but to the slow and regular working out of physical laws, in accordance with which each has assumed its existing weight and bulk, and path and position." This is what makes this kind of writing so offensive. No Catholic need have any quarrel with evolution, as seen in the light of a sound philosophy. Probably a large proportion of Catholics of science believe in it to a greater or less extent. We ask why in the name of common sense is the slow and regular working out of physical laws in opposition to external design and deliberate creation? To return to Darwinism: "With the appearance of the "Origin of Species," in 1859, the departure began. In twenty years the whole world was converted *en bloc*." If this means that the

[1] It is needless to mention that Professor Mivart believes in the evolution of the body only.

scientific world has accepted Darwin's theory as he propounded it, we can only reply by repeating a flat contradiction.[1]

We now come to the *piece de resistance*, the triumph of bumblepuppy. "Life thus falls into its proper place in the scheme of things as due essentially to the secondary action of radiated solar energy, intercepted on the moist outer crust of a cooling and evolving planet." Life is due essentially to solar energy! It is as simple as that! No, on second thoughts it is not perfectly simple. It is due to the secondary action of this energy. Why to the secondary, and not to the primary? And, after all, why to solar energy at all? Why is not solar energy producing life now? There are still several moist parts of the crust of the earth. Or is it, perhaps, that the planet is no longer "cooling and evolving?" But the most disappointing part of it is, that only four lines later the author returns to the question as if he had not exhausted it. "How the first organisms came to exist at all we can as yet only conjecture; to feeble and unimaginative minds, the difficulty of such a conjecture seems grotesquely exaggerated." Although a brilliant imagination is of great assistance to reason, it does not follow that what is known as an unimaginative mind is necessarily a weak one. Indeed, in scientific work the imagination needs to be held well in check. To understand this passage we must recall the definition of bumblepuppy. It consists in playing the game "either in utter ignorance of all its known principles, or in defiance of them, or both." It is clear, then, that in bumblepuppy the imagination is to have full play. Under these circumstances the idea of an act of creation becomes, no doubt, very grotesque. The subject, however, is not pursued and the author goes on as follows: "But granting the existence of a prime organism or group of organisms *plus* the fact of reproduction with heredity and variations, and the tendency of such reproduction to beget increase in a geometrical ratio, we can deduce from these simple elementary factors the necessary corollary of survival of the fittest, with all its far-reaching and marvellous implications." Why we are to admit these premises we are left to conjecture. The request strikes us as rather a cool one from the spokesman of those who claim to believe only on evidence. "The gorilla," we are told, "appeared on the scene at the critical moment for the 'Descent of Man.'" It is possible enough that the discovery of this animal may have had its effect on the ignorant, but anato-

[1] As an example of our author's recklessness of statement we would refer to another part of this paper, in which, treating of the progress of science in particular departments, he writes as follows of anæsthesia: "Chloroform was first employed by Simpson in 1847, and the use of other similar agents is still more recent." The fact is ether was used for surgical operations at the Massachusetts General Hospital in 1846. Its success induced Simpson to try chloroform.

mists do not consider the gorilla as notably higher than the chimpanzee. The late Professor Jeffries Wyman held that the latter approached nearer to man than the former. Without discussing this question we may say that each approaches more nearly to the structure of man in some respects than the other, but what is certain is that the gorilla does not in the least serve as a link or make the break between man's body, even, and that of the apes practically smaller. But let us return to the pantomime. "Just on the stroke when they were most needed, connecting links, both fossil and living, turned up in abundance between fish and amphibians, amphibians and reptiles, reptiles and birds, birds and mammals, and all of these together in a perfect network of curious cross-relationship." That many intermediate forms have been recently discovered is true; but the reader who would gather from this that a system of easy gradations has been brought to light would be greatly in error, and, moreover, this curious network of cross-relationship is particularly difficult to account for by Darwinism.

Psychology is not left unnoticed. "Instinct has been clearly separated from reason, the working of intelligence and of moral feeling has been recognized in horse and dog, in elephant and parrot, in bee and ant, in snail and spider." Surely all but the most gullible must know that this is simply absurd. The separation of reason and instinct is no recent achievement. The tendency of evolutionary thought has certainly not been to separate but to confound them; a statement of which the above passage gives ample evidence. We cannot stop, however, to discuss the "morals" of snails and spiders, nor to inquire how far they may be guilty of gluttony, envy and sloth. Many other amusing extracts might be made, but it is time to reach the peroration. We should state, however, that the chief point of the paper, besides evolution, is the doctrine of the conservation and correlation of forces. In conclusion Mr. Allen dwells on the unity of nature. This is the monistic philosophy. There is no antithesis of mind and matter. This wonderful science of his "exhibits to us the animal organism as essentially a food-engine in whose recess solar energy stored as potential by the plant, is once more let loose by slow combustion in the kinetic form as heat and motion." It is evident that even if this theory could account for an automaton-like life of movement, it fails utterly to explain the phenomena of free will, of sensation, of growth in certain definite directions and the marvels of reproduction. "It (science) unifies and organizes all our concepts of the whole consistent system of nature, and sets before our eyes the comprehensive and glorious idea of a cosmos which is one and the same throughout, in sun and star, and world and atom; in light and heat, and life and mechanism; in herb and tree, and man and

animal; in body, soul and spirit, mind and matter." This is no doubt very fine as pyrotechnics, but there is something wanting in clearness. If this be true, what conceivable meaning is there in the words, *body*, *soul*, *mind and matter*, since one is not to be distinguished from the other; or if, at least, all are of one category? This confusion of essentially different things, though very much the fashion, is not particularly new, so that we cannot subscribe to the poor tribute to our times with which our author closes: "Almost all that is most vital and essential in our conception of our illimitable dwelling house, the last half century has built up for us unaided."

We now turn to the paper on "The Progress of Thought in our Time," by Mr. Symonds, to whom Mr. Allen alludes as a philosophic thinker. At first one is inclined to expect an antidote to Mr. Allen's materialism, for we are assured of the writer's belief that the main fact in the intellectual development of the last half century is "the restoration of spirituality to our thoughts about the universe." This, indeed, were a consummation devoutly to be wished. We find, moreover, that Mr. Symonds dissents entirely from Mr. Allen's closing assertion, and believes that three centuries of scientific and philosophical labor have culminated in evolution. He thinks that present views are, after all, only provisional, while Mr. Allen, though descanting on the youth of science, apparently looks on his dreams as facts established beyond fear of revolution. It is natural that religion should have a chief place in a paper on thought, and Mr. Symonds has much to say about Christianity. He begins by the repetition of that ten times told tale, that Christianity is in some way connected with the idea that the earth is the centre of the universe. He has only contempt for those who believe that God made nature for man; and the sun, moon and stars to give him light. These ideas fit men's minds for the "mythological elements of Christianity." We are told it becomes difficult to take the scheme of salvation literally, when we remember that it is for the benefit of a race on a third-rate planet. These difficulties come from anthropomorphic ideas of God, with which positivists are fond of taunting believers while they themselves are most open to the reproach. Not only are they unable to grasp the idea that God's ways are not ours, but they seem unable to apprehend that, humanly speaking, one thing may serve more than one purpose. Do the heavens declare the glory of God any the less because the orbs composing them fulfill hundreds of physical purposes? Is a large world more worthy of God than a small one? Does the possession of four satellites make a planet a fitter field for the stupendous miracles of salvation than another with only one? The supreme ignorance of, or indifference to, what opinions Christians really hold is characteristic of

both these writers. Mr. Allen points out that science has made us familiar with the idea that man started from a low condition instead of being an "archangel ruined," and Mr. Symonds shows how the Copernican system annihilated "the brazen vault of heaven, or the crystal sphere on the outer surface of which God sat;" but what doctor of the Church ever defended these propositions?

It is not to be denied that systems of false philosophy, absurd and contradictory though they be, have pretty nearly destroyed such distorted remnants of faith as Protestantism can claim, and have put even Catholics to some extent on the defensive; but nothing that has received scientific confirmation has come into real conflict with faith. It is perfectly true, as Mr. Symonds implies, that the doctrine of the fall of man is in contradiction with thoroughgoing evolution of soul and body. But the evolution of the soul is merely an assertion, and that of the body at most a working hypothesis. The former is not true, the latter is not proved; and even if the latter should be proved, it is in no kind of opposition to the fall of Adam. Mr. Symonds errs in ascribing grotesque ideas to believers, and in leaving the Church out of the question altogether. It is to be said in his defense that he is writing of the thought of English scientific society, and we can admit freely that religious beliefs which it was respectable to hold a generation or two ago, have not been able to withstand the current when not founded on the rock of the Catholic Church.

Leaving the destructive effects of modern thought, Mr. Symonds attempts to show its constructive and elevating influences, and to establish his startling statement, that it is a return to spirituality. We are assured that, though "the universe is one homogeneous whole, in which nothing can be lost and unaccounted for, through which there runs a continuity of energizing forces, and of which we are indisputably conscious members," the belief in God is left untouched. What this untouched belief will amount to appears later. "I venture to assert," says our author, "that it is the destiny of the scientific spirit to bring these factors, God, law, Christian morals, into a new and vital combination, which will contribute to the durability and growth of rational religion."

The following demonstration is one of the most astonishing pieces of argumentation that was ever met with. It begins by begging the whole question for the major premise. "Science establishes the unity of the Kosmos (in which it is evident from the context that God is included), together with the exact correspondence and correlation of its parts." No evidence of this is given; we are only told that science establishes it. And here we must pause to mention a peculiarity of writers of this class. While overflowing with enthusiasm about the conservation of energy, the

correlation of forces, etc., they do not explain with sufficient detail what the world is made of. They say nothing of matter and form, of atomism, dynamism, and the modification of these systems. Probably they would look on this as unprofitable. But how can science establish the unity of the cosmos, if it does not tell us what it is made of? If it is all spirit, how account for the universal belief in matter? If it is all matter, how shall we account for phenomena that violate the laws of matter? If it is both, how are they combined, or, what share has each? Or, putting spirit aside, how can we speak conclusively of the laws of matter, and make sweeping generalizations without some definition of matter itself? Is it made of atoms or not? If so, how small are they, and are the smallest still divisible? Are they in contact? If not, what is between them? These are questions that we surely have a right to ask of those who pretend to know as much about the universe as these gentlemen do.

The minor premise is that we are mind, and "nothing in the last resort but mind." This is reached by the *cogito ergo sum* route, which proves at most (if indeed it is anything more than the assertion of a self-evident fact) that we have mind, not that we are mind, and nothing else. Thus we begin with two unproved, and, as it happens, false premises, and reach the conclusion that, as we are mind and an integrating part of the whole, mind is everywhere and in everything. This is not stated in this place quite so plainly, but we are sure it is precisely what Mr. Symonds means, as we shall show at once. We must be pardoned for introducing a rather long example of the purest bumblepuppy we have met with for some time. "Finding thought to be the very essence of man considered as a natural product, we are compelled to believe that there is thought in all the products which compose this universe. Nothing can be clearer, as the result of three centuries of scientific industry, than that there is neither loss of elements nor abrupt separation of species in the Kosmos, but that the whole is wrought of the same ground materials, and evolved in the multiplicity of its forms out of the same fundamental constituents. If, then, we discover thought in man upon one plane of this immense development, how can we deny it to existences on other planes? How can we conceive that the primitive energies out of which the whole proceeded were not conscious, or pregnant with consciousness? If mind is our sole reality and self, is it not the sole reality and self of all? Does not our mind necessitate a universal mind? Must we maintain that, the universe being in one rhythm, things less highly organized than man possess consciousness, in the degrees of their descent, less acute than man's? Must we not also surmise that ascending scales of existence more highly organized, of which we are at pre-

sent ignorant, are endowed with consciousness superior to man's? It is not incredible that the globe on which we live is vastly more conscious of itself than we are of ourselves; and that the cells which compose our corporeal frame are gifted with a separate consciousness of a simpler kind than ours."

Would that we had the pen of the author of "Alice in Wonderland," to reproduce the conversations between the conscious cells of different orders that contribute to this rhythm of the universe! Even then the task would be no easy one, if we are to follow our author. The consciousness of the globe puzzles us. We should have expected to find it lower than that of plants and animals, but instead, it is not incredible that it is higher than our own, which would imply a higher being. If the cells in our bodies have each a consciousness, is our consciousness the sum of theirs? In that case, if a man loses a leg, he must be a quarter less conscious. But would the leg have a consciousness of its own, besides that of the individual component cells? But, then, if we are nothing but mind, it is impossible that we should have a corporeal framework.

But what becomes of God in this scheme? As well as we can make out, law with a capital L takes God's place. All that is supernatural in Christianity disappears at once. "Science as yet can neither affirm nor deny the life beyond the grave." Virtue and vice, we presume, are no more. Not a bit of it! We forget that we are in the realms of bumblepuppy. Faith, hope and love are to persist. We are still to have "the noble humanities secured to us by Christianity," whatever that may mean. "How far more lovingly," exclaims Mr. Symonds, "we look on nature now than when we regarded it as alien and accursed." What a pity that St. Francis of Assisi could not have sat at the feet of this prophet! What a pity that St. Vincent de Paul is not here to learn from him a broader love of his neighbor, that should embrace stocks and stones. And yet it appears that this new love has its limits, after all. "If we recognize the divine life in parasites, we do not mean to acquiesce in their domination." Let us listen reverently while this philosophic thinker tells us why, and makes the new profession of faith. "The soul possessed of evolutionary religion, penetrated with the gospel of the century, runs no peril of lapsing into the hebetude of decadent Buddhism, or of exclaiming with folded hands, 'Whatever is, is well.' That formula will have to be exchanged for, 'Whatever is, is well, but nothing really is which is not progressive and militant movement.'" Now this is very consoling. If anything presents signs of decay, it does not really exist. We may see it, and smell it, but really there is no such thing, which is very gratifying. Still, it leaves us in doubt as to our conduct towards parasites. They certainly present progress and

militant movement, consequently they really exist, and whatever is, is well. Moreover, according to Mr. Symonds, we recognize the divine life in them. Why, then, are we justified in eliminating them at the risk of interfering with the universal rhythm? In fact, in this hodgepodge there is no comprehensible distinction between creator and creature, soul and body, the whole or the part, and yet, lo and behold! Christian morals are to flourish in it. "All the elements of morality are not displaced, but remoulded by the scientific spirit." Virtue in some incomprehensible way is to be its own reward, and vice its own punishment. We are promised no resurrection, but our far off descendants may profit by our virtue. "There is something," we are told, "in contributing to the advance of humanity, from which we derive everything, who expects from us so much." But what do we owe to humanity after all, if, as Mr. Allen teaches, solar energy is the cause of life? Moreover, if the earth and sun on the one hand, and the cells composing our bodies on the other, are all conscious, have they Christian morals too? If the sun does not lie, will future comets have longer tails? If the liver cells have faith, will the digestion of posterity be stronger?

It is surely a wonderful but not an encouraging state of things when a leading review on a state occasion publishes papers like these, purporting to be scientific, but really written in ignorance of the rules of science, or in violation of them, or both. The place of reason is taken by arrogant assertion, and the ignorance or forbearance of the public is imposed upon. That the ignorance and forbearance are so great is much to be regretted. It is sad that the public should receive as science what in another field is called bumblepuppy.

SOME ASPECTS OF PRIVATE FORTUNES.

INEQUALITIES in the wealth of individuals must be expected, because there are inequalities in the individuals themselves, inequalities in the way both of talents and of circumstances. Even could a substantial equality be realized, it would not be desirable, as creating a lessened opportunity for the play of those humanities which a variety in conditions invites, and which ennoble and sweeten life—the rich dispensing, the poor receiving. Apparently, an essential of a perfect social organism is that its spirit should allow free passing from one grade into another, and fall in with the observed tendencies on the part of the lower grades to rise, and of the higher to sink. There is a cycle within which, in a properly constituted society, such a revolution, on the whole, takes place, and compensations are adjusted.

But private fortunes may become excessive. Manifestly, there is a point which the inequality between rich and poor should not transcend, and evil is the day when the logical tendencies of society widen the gap.

We observe, therefore, the efforts of the great law-givers in every age to check such a tendency, and keep the inequality within bounds. Among these, foremost in time, as in place, stands Moses. The fiftieth year was the year of jubilee, beyond which a deed for land could not be executed by an Israelite, and in which all land that had been alienated, save possessions in walled cities, was restored to the original owner. Is there ground for limiting the operation of the law, or at least its spirit, to that ancient people? And are we to see herein nothing of a divine warrant against overgrown private fortunes?

With this law's neglect the downfall of the Hebrews stands closely allied. The conquests made in the brilliant reigns of David and Solomon not only brought in wealth, but foreigners also and their example. Ancient law and simplicity were forgotten. Private fortunes rose. Luxurious habits grew. The line between rich and poor was clearly and permanently drawn. The State became broken in twain, and on the rival thrones followed, for the most part, successions of degenerate kings, whose deeds ended with the blotting out of the nations.

The spirit and letter of Lycurgus' laws were likewise designed to check inequality of fortunes; and, as long as his statutes were kept, Sparta triumphed. After the fall of Athens, private fortunes

in Lacedæmon grew excessive; the people, however, were impoverished, and Sparta soon lost her supremacy.

The agrarian laws introduced by Licinius had the same end in view. Under their operation the poorest citizen was entitled to at least four acres of land; the richest could not possess over 315, nor could he send to the public pastures more than 100 head of cattle and 500 sheep. The censors, besides, exercised strict scrutiny and reported all the lands that were not duly cultivated. It is the brightest portion of Roman story, when men like Regulus lived. An anecdote of him marks the spirit of the period. While on the tide of success in the first Punic war, he applies for a leave of absence under remarkable circumstances. The few acres near Rome that constituted the hero's sole fortune, he had intrusted to a client with instructions to till the land and provide for his two daughters. These write to him that the faithless client has fled, taking with him almost all the farming implements, and Regulus seeks a temporary return to provide against their impoverishment.

It is a refreshing picture of simplicity and grandeur. And, after all, to live simply is itself to live grandly. These were the days of moderate private fortunes, when Rome was in the best sense opulent, and great and powerful as she never was afterwards.

The laws of Licinius came to be disregarded. In attempting their restoration the Gracchi fell. After their fall the rich enormously increased their riches. By fraud or violence they acquired the small farms of their poor neighbors and, controlling legislation, caused the undivided lands to be distributed amongst themselves. Slaves, exempt from military duty, were employed in cultivating the immense estates. Hence arose such millionaires as Lucullus and Crassus. When Cæsar became dictator, it is said, 2000 men in Rome owned everything, and 320,000 indigent heads of families were fed from the public treasury. The manliness of the free population of Italy was destroyed. The able-bodied men, drafted into armies, came back at the end of their terms to form, by such accretions, an indolent and shiftless mass with no means of living beyond the bounty of the state, and ready to set over the rich any tyrant who would promise to divide their wealth among the poor.

So the empire fell, as Sparta and the Hebrew polity had fallen before—and in each instance a primary cause was the individual concentration of wealth. Let the past be quoted again, if it has lessons for the present.

A prodigious increase in the production of wealth and its distribution against the common man are characteristics of our age. If small fortunes have multiplied, great ones have multiplied more rapidly. The gap between rich and poor has widened and is widening. The struggle to live, in the lower ranks especially, is

great and growing. Laborers often get little more than what is necessary to mere subsistence. The enormous wealth that steam-power has originated has gone to swell the fortunes of the upper class. In certain mining districts of Pennsylvania the mine owners are millionaires, the *per diem* of the miner not over seventy cents. The poor are relatively poorer than they were thirty years ago.

The most superficial view apparently shows this. All must be conscious of the unusual pressure almost everywhere prevailing. By the way, is it not a vulgar mark on the period? A certain quantum of ease is requisite to gentility. Well-bred instincts, disgusted at press and hurry, are inclined to look away from a whirling locomotive age towards a gentler, superior past—steamless, yet sufficient.

What a pressure to get work! How many thousands of good, needy men are daily striving for permission to work at almost anything, and for almost any price? The diary of one of these poor fellows we chanced to see; here is a paragraph: "Weeks and weeks go by in the vain effort to get honorable work. I almost despair. Sick at heart I roam the streets. How selfish the city seems! How cold and unsympathetic appear the throngs that pass me! They surge by with ungenerous eye. Their looks are all self-seeking. I shudder and shrink within myself."

What a pressure to live by the work! Were strikes ever so common and so wide-spread? Admit there have been foolish strikes, and causeless strikes, and selfish, wicked strikes. The definition of a strike remains, a remedy forced on workingmen to keep them from starvation wages. These strikes to the strikers are often costly and dangerous expedients, but accepted to ward off greater danger. Certain Pennsylvania miners are reported as having come out of one so reduced physically as to be unable for a time to do a fair day's work.

What a pressure in doing the work! When have "bosses" been so exacting, or subordinates so urged? The Baltimore car-drivers, for instance. The weight of an outraged public opinion has, it is true, somewhat improved their condition. Until recently, however, many were required to do steady work for seventeen hours out of the twenty-four; and we had it from one that he had not seen his little child awake for three months, as he left it abed in the morning and returned to it abed at midnight. That hundreds stood ready to fill a vacated position deepens the strain disclosed in such a statement.

There is pressure almost everywhere, but concentrated upon the poor man at the bottom. The root lies in the unjust distribution of wealth, which cuts the poor with a double edge. For while the colossal private fortunes at the top have greatly advanced, all

the way down the standard of living, at the same time, the ability of the poor man to meet the increased expenditure is relatively less.

Certain professional political economists among us persist in putting it before the public that under an increase of wages and the cheapening (as they allege) of the necessaries of life, the condition of laboring men has vastly improved. The estimate is that mechanics of special skill are 100 per cent. better off than in 1840; average mechanics, 75 per cent.; common laborers, 65 per cent.; and that, if the lower ranks are pressed, it is due, not to the age or to institutions, but to personal faults, to viciousness, idleness or ignorance.

The conclusion we believe to be utterly untrustworthy. These writers, with an opinion to maintain, choose and group data (perhaps unconsciously) in that direction. For a graphic *exposé* of such a bias, we refer the reader to "Economic Optimism," in the April number of the *North American Review.* The most authoritative writers are *per contra.* Of such, none stand higher than the late Postmaster General of Great Britain, who gave exhaustive attention to the investigation of labor questions, and who deliberately declares that in England—confessedly the richest of nations, where laws have been modified in every way to cheapen food, and where steam-power has wrought its best work—the condition of the laboring class has been relatively lowered and the gap between rich and poor decidedly enlarged since the advent of steam. His words are: "A majority of the people of this country" (and the social status of our own land differs little, if at all, from that of England) "have a severe struggle for existence, and no inconsiderable minority live in abject misery and in degrading poverty. One out of every twenty is a pauper. To a great proportion of our laboring classes a life of incessant toil yields no other result than an old age of dependent mendicancy." Bitter words!

Mr. Fawcett's conclusion is confirmed by careful personal inquiries among the laboring class. What better witnesses than intelligent and reliable workingmen themselves, who have always lived at the same social level, and whose working life runs back thirty years and more? They tell us their lot is harder now—that they could "knock on" (to use one of their expressions) easier then—that they *feel* it to be so; and they furnish a firm foundation for the feeling in the following figures.

From these figures it is a question whether even the *possible* opportunities of workingmen are better now. The wages, indeed, have increased, but the most necessary expenditure has increased, perhaps, more rapidly. A deal of misconception prevails in regard to the supposed cheapening of modern products. Writers are

caught by the lowered price, forgetting there is often such a lowering in workmanship and lasting qualities as to reverse to the consumer the article's value. But to the figures, as they have been given us by workmen. The comparison is between 1850 and 1887:

As regards wages: A common field hand who thirty years since got 37½ cents (with board), now gets 50 cents. A carpenter who then got $1.50 now gets $2.50. Bricklayers, $2.75 then, $4 now. The average increase is about 50 per cent. It must be added, however, as an important consideration materially lowering this increase, that mechanics, thirty years ago, commonly had steady employment, while now they often work scarcely above half-time.

In the matter of expenditure: The important items of flour and sugar remain at about the same price. Yet, in respect to bread, it should be noted, that laboring men, a generation back, used, to a far greater extent, the much cheaper article of corn meal. Bacon, by the 100 pounds, that then cost 4 cents to 6 cents, now costs 8 cents. Beef, per quarter, 4 cents then, 9 cents now. Coffee, 8 to 10 cents then, 16 cents now. Tobacco (important to workingmen), 18 cents to 20 cents per pound then, 60 cents to 70 cents now. A house whose rental was then $5 per month, is now $10. A workman's hand-made shoes, 30 years back, cost $2.50; he now buys machine shoes at, say, $2; but a pair of the former would outlast two of the latter. Cotton prints then cost from 12 cents to 18 cents; they now sell at from 5 cents to 8 cents. But the old women tell us the calico of other days was of superior make, with lasting qualities treble those of the modern product. If the drinking bill of workingmen is taken into account,—and we think it should be, since we are to consider them as they commonly are, and not as a body of teetotalers,—the expenditure is greatly against the present day, not because there are more drunkards, but from the character of the beverage. Three-fifths of the workingmen, it is estimated, drink habitually. The ordinary drink is beer. Ten glasses a day are not an unusual number; whereas, a generation back, whiskey was the more common beverage, and to avoid intoxication the workingman was forced to stop at an expenditure of from 10 to 15 cents. But, omitting the drink item, a computation based on the above figures will show that a month's expenditure to-day, under rigid and even self-denying rules of economy, has advanced some 60 per cent., while the average wage increase, as above remarked, has been about 50 per cent.

We do not think, therefore, that the *possible* opportunities of the workingman are better to-day; while his actual, and, what we may call, unavoidable, outlay runs expenditure far above this 60 per cent. increase. His whole standard of living has been raised by an

example that despotically descends upon him from the super-wealthy classes. Call it extravagance, if you choose. No man of discernment will set it down as a personal fault, for not being free from which he stands culpable. It is an outlay demanded by imperious environments, by those laws regulating fashion and the general style of living that bind laboring people as distinctly as they do the upper strata of society. The workingman yields to an inexorable social movement, whose impulse originates in the colossal private fortunes at the top. As an illustration of this advanced expediture: Thirty years back the daughter of an average mechanic would find in a cotton print or neat homespun her holiday attire; she now dresses in cloths and cashmeres. Her shoes then were generally a low-quartered kind, which journeymen turned out at $5 per dozen; now-a-days her feet go protected in a $3 article. And so along the entire line the style of living has been raised, and expenditure advanced over 100 per cent. In Baltimore—a city somewhat exceptional for its moderation and comparative social ease,—an average mechanic's family of four heads (it is their own testimony) can live on little, if any, under $10 per week; while such a family, a generation back, lived comfortably on $4 to $4.50.

In calling attention to the untoward aspects presented by vast pecuniary accumulations in individual hands, we recognize the splendid deeds of charity and of beneficence which men of such wealth have done, the splendid enterprises they originate and carry through, the splendid developments they have wrought, and the commanding talents whereof all this is the sign. Moderate fortunes, setting an example of moderation in the way of living, are rather the nation's blessing. China, with her hand labor, and moderate, diffused, unambitious prosperity, offers, even to *us*, some enviable phases of family life. It is false teaching on the part of certain professional political economists, that it is immaterial to the common weal how vast soever private fortunes may become, provided they are accumulated by the possessors themselves, without fraud or violence; and such writers favorably compare the great fortunes of to-day with those of ancient times, acquired, generally, by disreputable means. There are, indeed, many fortunes among us that have been individually won, and by the purest methods; but true economic science requires that even these should not be excessive. As for our *great fortunes*, how far their skirts hang free from fraud, to what degree they are not unhallowed acquisitions, may be a question. They are often the coinage of conscience-blighting, soulless corporations and monopolies, cursed of old by the prophet in them who "join house to house and lay field to field;" those enormous money aggregations,

that combine wealth to swell wealth, pushing every advantage against the weak, pressing and triumphing in their huge power. The stigma deepens when we see combinations of plutocrats making necessaries of life the subject of their speculative rivalries, and, to swell their plethora, fictitiously advancing, as recently done, the cost of living over the land. Some of our most colossal fortunes are intimately connected with speculations of this nature, and it is a crying shame that such a thing can be. What so fit to make wealth hateful? It deepens the ominous scowl of the pressed and suffering mass below. Can no law be framed to check a lust of gain so infamous? Or must we accept it as one of the inevitable signs of decadence, and "steam on," with such fagots for fuel, towards the end that awaits states as well as individuals?

Apart, however, from methods of acquisition, the acquisitions themselves are a national evil. I speak of the huge fortunes at the top. What if the millionaires can be counted off on the fingers? They set a standard of living. They reside in mansions costing a million, and with furnishings worth a million more—they sport turn-outs valued at thousands—their horses are stabled, their dogs are kenneled far more comfortably than many of the deserving poor. In the grade of fortunes just below, there are thousands who live *towards* this style, many being strained in the effort. In the grade next succeeding these, the ten thousand possessors of moderate fortunes are strained in the endeavor to live in the same general direction; and so the example and the deepening strain and *anxietas* descend upon the poor man at the bottom, who, with aspirations aroused and a rate of expenditure more than doubled, has an increase of wages not over half as much again to meet it.

Here we find a main source of the pressure present (it may be said) everywhere, save in the most opulent strata. On these summits there is ease, and the outlook is full of complacency; but scarcely so anywhere else. In the report of a recent strike the mine owner and the miners, each, make exhibits, the former showing that *he* could not live unless the wages of his workmen were lowered; the latter, that *they* could not live, unless the wages were advanced.

Another aspect of private fortunes is worthy of notice. "It is ominous how wealth invades the United States Senate," was the remark of a distinguished speaker in a late campaign. It is ominous, too, it may be added, how social exactions at the National Capital are making the possession of abundant wealth a practical qualification in a cabinet minister. Upon the retirement of Mr. Manning it was bruited about that the Treasury portfolio had been offered to the Speaker of the House, but declined on the ground, as was alleged, that his private fortune was insufficient to properly

support the station. We do not vouch for the truth of this, but the reported facts, under all the circumstances, might have occurred, and it is, indeed, a pregnant thought that our purest and best men may be constrained to decline office from such a consideration. In the same vein are the newspaper twittings that have been directed against a cabinet minister for so rigidly excluding himself from Washington gayeties; and the ground of the self-imposed exclusion was doubtless the same, that gentlemanly instincts forbade the acceptance of invitations which his private means were inadequate to suitably return.

Washington, of late years, has made giant strides. The capital of so great a nation attracts influences from every quarter. Incipient institutions of learning are gravitating thitherward for establishment. Superb homes for men of wealth and leisure are increasingly in demand. With the *beau monde* a "winter at Washington" is now the very thing itself; and beyond the political and scientific rays that gather there, this brilliant centre is reflecting more and more the fashion and display of a rich and powerful country. In the diversions of social life the wives and daughters of cabinet ministers are looked upon as leaders. We all remember the accounts, last winter, of their superb entertainments, following each other in splendid and costly succession. The salaries of ministers are relatively very small, and unless these social exactions, requiring an expenditure somewhat colossal, be relaxed, it will soon come to pass, if the point has not been already reached, that a President, to have his administration duly supported, will feel bound, in choosing his advisers, to look to their purse as well as to their statesmanship. It is a state of affairs connected with the greatly advanced scale of living traceable to our colossal private fortunes, and to real republican eyes has a dangerous look.

Our purpose has been to present some aspects of these "piles"; yet a word as to remedies. Mr. George (indirectly) offers one, the acceptance of which would radically affect the present order of affairs. Mr. Lorillard,—himself a millionaire,—conscious of the evils to be apprehended from the "concentration and perpetuation of vast wealth in single families," suggests a legacy tax to the State of 10 per cent. on all private fortunes over $200,000.

Whatever may be the attempted political solution of these pregnant problems which the logical tendencies of the period are rapidly thrusting to the front, the Church has her opportunity for, at least, lessening the strain. She has ever been the friend of the oppressed poor. Let her renew her beauty in the glorious traditions of earlier days, and rear, in the midst of this self-seeking age, the beacon-light of a higher individual charity—that admirable gift, the very bond of peace and of all virtues, which the Apostle

ranks before Faith or Hope, since divine Charity remains when Faith becomes sight and Hope is swallowed up in fruition. There is a call for that self-abnegation, that enthusiasm for humanity, whereof our Lord Jesus was Himself the signal teacher and exemplar, and which so wrought in the early disciples that "they had all things common, and, selling their possessions and goods, divided them to all according as every one had need." Such a spirit was a power then, for many were drawn towards the Church by seeing "how these Christians love each other;" and it would avail to-day in softening the world's stony heart.

WAS THE PAPACY IN COMMISSION?

NO stronger evidence of how the members of the Anglican body have been driven to the wall in their controversy with the Catholic Church could be needed than the utterly changed nature of their attacks upon her. We no longer hear, at all events from the right wing of the High-Church party, boastful assertions of the validity of their orders, as though the possession of what they incorrectly term apostolic succession were all that is needed to constitute a religious body in the unity of the true Church. They, of course, implicitly still maintain this claim, but in the face of the terrible criticism to which it has been subjected of late years, they think it best to let the subject lie dormant. Nor, again, in their more strictly aggressive methods do we find the same points of attack adhered to, as was their wont fifteen or twenty years ago. Of course, the Vatican Council, and all the imaginary complications which it gave rise to in the brains of non-Catholic statesmen and theologians, has in the years elapsed since its prorogation been a text pregnant with matter for the exercise of both tongue and pen; but the latest efforts of Ritualistic polemics appear now to be centred in showing, not so much that the Church of Rome has erred in matters of faith, and that therefore their separation is justifiable, but that either, as the *Church Quarterly Review* maintained some time ago, the Papal succession and its consequent jurisdiction came to an end in the Middle Ages, intending to prove thereby that, as no valid occupant of Peter's chair was in existence, none could be under an obligation to be

in communion with him; or else, that no Papal succession, as derived from St. Peter, had ever existed at all. The former of these remarkable theories having, however, been proved inadmissible, it became necessary to invent the second, and for this purpose the "Fathers of the Society of St. John the Evangelist" (who have already made themselves somewhat conspicuous both in Boston and Philadelphia) have thrown themselves into the breach and fabricated a hypothesis which, we presume, may be regarded as the very latest thing in Anglican polemics, and which, while scarcely less ingenious, is, we venture to say, equally as untenable as any of its predecessors.

It would appear that the Rev. Luke Rivington (of the above named society) has lately been engaged in a pamphlet controversy with Mgr. Meurin, S. J., the Catholic Bishop of Bombay. This discussion has resulted in the publication, first in the *Indian Churchman*, and subsequently in book form under the title of "The Roman Catholic Claims" (Elliot Stock, London), of a series of ten controversial papers, with an appendix. In the now exploded theory of the failure of Papal jurisdiction, above referred to, our Anglican contemporary, while admitting that in the early centuries of the Church some sort of Petrine primacy was recognized, maintained that at some particular period between the tenth and fifteenth centuries it must have died out by reason of the simoniacal election of several series of Popes, and other uncanonical actions on their part which so vitiated the validity of their appointment to the sacred purple that in time no validly appointed college of cardinals existed, and so no Pope could be validly elected. But our worthy friends have apparently come to the conclusion, upon second thought, that this was conceding a vast deal too much; it may even have struck them that the idea that Almighty God would support by His providence an unbroken Petrine succession as the centre of unity in the Church for a thousand years and then allow it to go to pieces, was just a little illogical, and they have therefore determined to carry the war still further into Africa,—this time a very long distance indeed,—and demonstrated the fact, which, being proved, would, of course, give the *quietus* to Rome and its usurpations, that during the first century there was not only no universal Pope, but *no bishop of Rome at all!*

"Father" Rivington's little *brochure* contains, as we have said, ten distinct papers, upon many of which, as they have no bearing upon the present subject, we shall not dwell at any length. The first, on the "Unity of the Church," simply contains some feeble quibbles about the relation of St. Paul to St. Peter. No. II., however, contains so glaring a misrepresentation of the true theory

of St. Vincent of Lerins as to the constitution of the Church, that we cannot pass it over without a word of explanation.

The author, to quote the London *Church Times*, in its summary of this chapter, "compares the treatise of Vincent of Lerins with modern Papal doctrine, and shows that no glimmer of the Papal idea had ever crossed his mind, and that the second century was just that one when an infallible guide and a short way to the truth was most urgently needed, from the bewildering variety of Gnostic sects; but no Father seems for a moment to have dreamt that Rome had the key to the problem."

These two statements may be dismissed in a very few words. First, as regards St. Vincent, we find him, in his "Commonitorium," writing as follows:

"In days past, therefore, Agripinus of blessed memory, Bishop of Carthage, the first of all mortal men, against the divine Scripture (canon), against the rule of the universal Church, held that baptism might be repeated,—then Pope Stephen of blessed memory, prelate of the apostolic see, resisted, with the rest of his colleagues indeed, but still beyond the rest, thinking it, I suppose, becoming that he should excel all the rest as much in devotion for the faith as he surpassed them in authority of place."[1]

And later on in the same treatise he speaks of the "Bishop of the city of Rome" as "head of the world," while styling St. Cyprian and other bishops its *sides*.[2] Comment is superfluous.

Again, as regards the other point, the second century could have no better spokesman than the great St. Irenæus, whose emphatic testimony that the apostolic see of Rome was even at that early period just that infallible guide and short way to the truth which, we are told, was most urgently needed, is well known to all students of this controversy.[3]

The fifth paper in this volume would appear to be among the most important, inasmuch as is here developed the latest theory of Anglicanism anent the government of the local Roman church,

---

[1] S. Vincent Lerin., Commonit. No. vi., apud Waterworth, Faith of Catholics, vol. i. p. 451.

[2] "Non solum caput orbis, verum etiam latera." Ibid. No. xxx.

[3] It may be as well to remind our readers that the saint's words are as follows: "For with this Church (the Roman), on account of its more powerful principality, every church must (*necesse est*) agree (*convenire*)." The argument drawn from this passage, which we cannot, of course, here reproduce, is that *convenire* here necessarily signifies *mental assent*, and *necesse* not a mere moral obligation, but an absolutely unavoidable necessity. Thus, to be in the visible unity of the Catholic Church, each Church must be in communion with and submission to the Church of Rome.—Cf. Murray, De Ecclesia Christi.

which we again reproduce in the condensed form of our contemporary, the *Church Times:*

"There is grave reason to doubt whether any Pope at all sat at Rome in the earliest times, for the evidence seems to denote the episcopate there having been in commission, perhaps all the members of a governing college having been in episcopal orders. One point illustrating this position might have been inserted, that when Pope Anicetus and St. Polycarp disputed about the time of keeping Easter, it was the Bishop of Smyrna who appealed to Apostolic precedent, while the Pope appealed, not to St. Peter (as St. Wilfrid did at Whitby several centuries later), nor to any Apostle at all, but to the 'presbyters' who had preceded himself (Euseb., H. E. v. 24); while St. Irenæus, when writing a protest to Pope Victor against his high-handed attempt to force his view on the Asiatic churches, uses this same word 'presbyters' to describe Victor's predecessors, though he is very careful to speak about 'bishops' in referring to other churches."

Our readers will, of course, observe that it is intended by the adoption of this theory of an "episcopate in commission" to cut away the very roots of the Petrine centre of unity. If this hypothesis were true, St. Peter, of course, was never Bishop of Rome at all, in the true sense of the word, and consequently his successors could not have received that office in due order from him. The *See* of Rome would, therefore, be the merely ecclesiastical creation of a later date, such as were the patriarchates in after times; and any *divine* authority to rule the whole Church existent in that See would turn out to be a fiction.

And yet, what are the facts? It will be observed that the reviewer (for it is only just to acquit Mr. Rivington of any share in this blunder) has the temerity to appeal to St. Irenæus, and endeavors to insinuate that the holy father must have been aware that the predecessors of St. Victor in the government of the Roman church could not have been bishops, because, while referring to the heads of all other churches under that title, he simply styled the former priests, or, as the translator in Bohn's "Eusebius" has it, *presbyters*. Now, we presume that even our contemporary would admit that St. Irenæus himself is at least as capable a witness and as good an exponent of his own meaning as any that can be produced by the combined wisdom of Little Queen street, and, unfortunately for the latter, he is equally "careful" to tell us, in the most emphatic and unequivocal terms, that the predecessors of St. Victor (and he mentions every one of them by name) were not a college of priests, or even of "persons in episcopal orders," but individual bishops, succeeding one another in regular order, just as they had done in every other See throughout Christendom.

Having observed that the "sacred office of the episcopacy" was first committed to Linus, mentioned by St. Paul in his epistle to Timothy, he continues:

"To him succeeded Anacletus, and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement obtains that episcopate. But to this Clement succeeded Evaristus, and to Evaristus, Alexander. Next to him, thus the sixth from the Apostles, Sixtus was appointed, and after him Telesphorus; next, Hyginus; then Pius; after whom was Anicetus. To Anicetus succeeded Soter, and to him Eleutherius, who now in the twelfth place holds the office of the episcopate. By this order, and *by this succession*, both the *tradition* which is in the Church from the Apostles and the *preaching* of the truth have come down to us."[1]

The Eleutherius here mentioned was the immediate predecessor of Pope St. Victor. A neat little commentary this, certainly, upon the idea that St. Irenæus was aware that St. Victor's predecessors were a college of priests, or, indeed, a college of any kind; and that, moreover, in the second century they had no infallible guide and knew of no "short way to the truth."

But although we have been able to call St. Irenæus himself as a witness against the interpretation thus put upon his words, it is only right to admit that a certain amount of uncertainty does hang over the names and order of the first three or four Pontiffs immediately succeeding St. Peter; it being in the first place somewhat dubious whether Cletus and Anacletus constitute one individual or two (although the opinion of historians inclines to the former hypothesis); and the case is still further confused by the fact that Tertullian[2] distinctly states that just as Polycarp was collated to the Church of Smyrna by St. John, so Clement was appointed to that of Rome by St. Peter. Some theologians are of opinion that this apparent discrepancy may be reconciled by supposing that St. Peter simply designated Clement as his successor, an office which that holy man declined to accept until after the death of Linus, who, they suppose, was coadjutor to St. Peter during the Apostle's lifetime, and who *de facto* succeeded him. It is, perhaps, more probable that St. Clement had been coadjutor, or rather vicar, of St. Peter during his Apostolic journeys, and was subsequently, in the order given by St. Irenæus (in which he is followed by both Eusebius and St. Augustine), elevated to the Pontifical chair. But as a matter of fact, the solution of this slight difficulty is in no way material to our purpose, for the fact remains, and it is an incontrovertible one, that during that very period throughout which Mr. Rivington supposes the See of Rome to have been held in

[1] Adv. Hæres., lib. iii., c.

[2] De Præscript. Hæret., No. xxxii.

commission, there was living, in the person of St. Irenæus, a great doctor and leader in the Church, removed but by one intervening generation from the Apostles themselves, and who in his youth, as he tells us, had seen Polycarp, the disciple of St. John; who, inasmuch as, according to St. Gregory of Tours, it was the venerable Polycarp himself who sent him to Lyons, must necessarily have gone there while quite young, but who, even had he been thirty years[1] of age on his arrival in Gaul, must still have enjoyed a clear half century of residence in the west; and who, it is absurd to suppose in a man of his prominence, learning and activity in Church matters, should have been ignorant during all this period, up to the time of his letter to Pope Victor, as to whether the Church of Rome was, and had been, governed by a bishop like other churches or by a college of priests. Even supposing that he had been in any doubt as to the actual successor of St. Peter, and his words do not seem to imply that he had any, this would not be a reason why he should speak of all Pope Victor's predecessors as priests, unless, on the one hand, he knew Mr. Rivington's hypothesis to be a fact, a supposition which, as we have seen, contradicts his own words most plainly expressed elsewhere, or else used the word *priest* in its broad sense, the sense in which it is used by St. Paul when he speaks of St. Timothy as having received the "imposition of the hand of the priesthood,"[2] whilst in another place[3] he explains that he himself had ordained him. St. Augustine, too, in his well-known "Psalm against the Donatists," speaks of the line of Roman Pontiffs up to his time simply as a succession of *priests*.

"*Number the priests* (sacerdotes) *from the chair of Peter itself*," and instances of this use of the word might be multiplied indefinitely.

An objection, however, may be raised which might at first sight have the appearance of giving some strength to Mr. Rivington's theory, or at all events to the idea that the immediate successors of St. Peter did not inherit the Supreme Pontifical authority, namely, the fact that in very early times these prelates were styled *vicars* of St. Peter, *Petri vicarii*, which seems to imply an inferiority. We must be careful, in dealing with this subject, to distinguish be-

---

[1] He was born in or about 120, made Bishop of Lyons in 177, and died a martyr probably about 202.

[2] 1 Tim. iv., 14.

[3] 2 Tim. i., 6. This use of the word is by no means unknown in English. Thus Shakespeare makes King John say:

> "Add this much more, that no Italian *priest*
> Shall tithe or toll in our dominions."—Act iii., scene 1.

Cf. also Henry VIII., act ii., scene 2; act iii., scene 2.

tween the *Apostolic* office in St. Peter and his primatial, as supreme teacher and governor of the universal Church; for, while the former was not, of course, transmitted to any individual man after the death of the Apostles, the latter, according to the testimony of all tradition, he did hand down and perpetuate in his successors in the See of Rome. In regard, of course, to the former, they were his inferiors, but certainly not in the latter relation, nor is any such distinction implied in the term *vicarii*, an expression which, as Peter Ballerini points out in his learned treatise "De vi ac ratione Primatus Romanorum Pontificum," is quite commonly used by the Fathers as a synonym for successor pure and simple. Thus St. Cyprian,[1] writing to Pope Stephen, calls him the vicar of his predecessors Cornelius and Lucius, but no one supposes that he was of any lower grade in the hierarchy than they. So, too, St. Gregory the Great[2] styles the bishop-elect of Milan, vicar of St. Ambrose, while even so late as 866 Thato, a bishop of the same city, applies to himself the same designation.[3] Many other instances of this custom might be adduced, a custom which is easily explained by the consideration that they who succeed any one in a given office, act in his stead (*vicem gerunt*). It is precisely in this sense that Philip, the Papal legate at the Council of Ephesus, declared that St. Peter "*even up to this time and always lives and judges in his successors*,"[4] and that St. Peter Chrysologus reminds the heretic Eutyches that "*Blessed Peter lives and presides in his own See.*"[5] Nothing, then, can surely be clearer than that no argument in favor of any other theory than that of a line of individual Pontiffs resident at Rome from the very beginning can be constructed upon the use of this expression.

But the absurdity of this quibble regarding the use of the word *presbyters* is still further demonstrated, and the matter completely set at rest, if we examine the wording of St. Irenæus's letter to Pope Victor as quoted by Eusebius. It contains the following words: "And those presbyters who governed the Church before Soter, and over which you now preside, I mean Anacletus and Pius, Hyginus with Telesphorus and Xystus, neither did themselves observe, nor did they permit those after them to observe it."[6] Now, when we remember that these Pontiffs are the self-same men of whom, in the passage above quoted, he several times speaks as having been elevated to the "sacred office of the *episco-*

---

1 Ep. lvii. Migne edition. "*Vicarius et successor eorum factus es.*"
2 Lib. I., Ep. 4, *ad Mediolanenses.* "*Vicarius Ambrosii.*"
3 Ambros. Basil. Monum., p. 200. Apud Ballerini, cap. i., p. 4.
4 Act III.
5 Inter Ep. Leonis, Ep. xxv.
6 *Hist. Eccl.*, Lib. v., c. 24. Bohn's translation.

pate," we are in a position to gauge the value of any theory built upon the supposition that they were members of a college, whether of priests or otherwise; since it is evident that such a theory derives no support whatever from the writings of St. Irenæus, who, from his proximity to Apostolic days, and his prominence in ecclesiastical affairs, could scarcely have been ignorant on this point. And such being the case, it becomes quite unnecessary for us to examine at any length the similar expression (*presbyters*) as used by Pope Anicetus, to which the *Church Times* also refers, without, however, stating that it is St. Irenæus himself, as we learn from Eusebius,[1] who puts the words into his mouth in the very same chapter in which occurs the passage we have already been considering. St. Irenæus tells us that by these "*presbyters*" he meant to signify the preceding *bishops* of Rome.

We are precluded alike by space and the limits of our subject from dwelling upon the matters touched upon in the remaining four papers. The seventh, "On the Nature of Schism," claims entirely to break up Cardinal Newman's comparison of the Anglican position with that of the Donatists. We were under the impression that the argument drawn from Donatism, so far from being from the pen of Cardinal Newman, was first elaborated by Cardinal Wiseman in the *Dublin Review*, and was one of the causes of the great Oratorian's final submission to the Church.

Anglican orders and the question of intention occupy the next two papers, both of them threadbare themes, while the tenth and last is upon "England and Rome," commenting upon which, by the way, the *Church Times* caps the climax by boldly asserting that "it would be easy to show that the whole Roman body is in material heresy, and those members of it who are seceders from the Church of England in formal heresy also." How this singular phenomenon is brought about our astute contemporary unfortunately does not enlighten us—unfortunately, because it leaves us in pitiable doubt as to whether the writer knows what material heresy signifies. Of course, if the reviewer really means to say that the Pope and all the theologians of the Catholic Church, including such names as Mazzella and Zigliara in the domain of theology, and Hergenröther and Hefele in ecclesiastical history, by reason of their non-acquaintance with Apostolic tradition and scientific theology, are in invincible, and therefore inculpable, ignorance, it is exceedingly charitable of him; but why should we unfortunate converts be expected to know more than the Pope and all the Fathers of the Vatican Council put together? We have had, it is true, the inestimable blessing, which but few of them had enjoyed, of having been reared in that clear and steady light and

[1] Ibidem.

that unwavering, unalterable conviction which Anglicanism ever bestows upon its highly favored clients; but we venture to say that there is not one "seceder from the Church of England" who will not bear witness with us that the transition from Anglican opinion to the certainty of Catholic faith is like bursting out of the depths of some dark and gloomy forest into the bright rays of the noonday sun; not one who, when he looks back upon the long years of groping, doubt and distress which preceded his conversion, does not daily go down upon his knees and bless that Divine, undeserved mercy which brought him step by step out of the dark labyrinths of ceremonialism and private judgment, into the blessed day-dawn of God's marvellous light.

EXCOMMUNICATION.

Pontificale Romanum. Summorum Pontificum Jussu Editum et a Benedicto XIV. Pont. Max. Recognitum et Castigatum. Mechliniæ: H. Dessain. MDCCCXLV.

THE principle involved in the theory and practice of excommunication applies not only to the Catholic Church, but to every human society where men are permanently organized for any rational purpose. Its ruling power, whether residing in the entire body or intrusted to its representatives, has a right to exclude members from a share in the benefits and privileges of which they have proved unworthy, and to cancel their membership by expulsion. And this, not only in a society to which one gives his voluntary adhesion, but also in those with which his connection depends not on choice, but on the unavoidable force of circumstances. One may become the citizen of a republic or the subject of a kingdom by voluntary tender of his allegiance or by the accident of birth. But neither choice nor accident will permanently secure his right. It is only good behavior that can be his warrant for immunity from expulsion. In old times and in most governments, whether absolute or democratic, the use of this power, when not pushed to the extreme of separation or isolation by perpetual imprisonment or removal by the infliction of death, was plainly seen in the penalty known ordinarily as exile or banishment; in other words, by material extrusion from the territory of

the commonwealth. Most modern states, that live nominally or really under a constitution, are content with the moral outlawry of criminals, forfeiture of civil rights, or deportation to their own penal settlements. Some modern states, however, enforce the penalty of exile, though unknown to their constitution and laws. Thus Great Britain and other powers have acted by their fraudulent systems of so-called emigration. Thus, too, Piedmont, in our own day, punished a distinguished prelate (Monsig. Fransoni, Archbishop of Turin) whose conscience would not bend to the will of an irreligious statesman. And this happens occasionally, too, in our own country where jurymen and governors commute of their own will the punishment of crime into acquittal and banishment. When juries pronounce a man innocent (or not to be punished) provided he leave the country or state, they may voice the public sentiment, but their way of doing it is no less absurd than illegal. We have known a governor of a State to pardon a criminal of whose guilt there could be no doubt, and for whose crime there could be no shadow of extenuating circumstance. He was pardoned with a peremptory order to leave the State within a few days and never return within its borders. The chief of the commonwealth was one of the most honorable men that ever lived, but was overcome by prayers, tears and entreaties that he knew not how to resist. But tender-heartedness, however amiable in itself, is not counted among the *fontes juris*, nor should it ever be allowed to override written law.

If the power of self-protection, spoken of above, belongs to every well-regulated state or community, with much more reason may we affirm that it is inherent in a society established amongst men by the God of all perfection. Hence it is but just to suppose that it was possessed in an eminent degree by the synagogue of old and its successor, the Church founded by Christ our Lord. In the synagogue it partook of the character of the people, whose stiff necks and uncircumcised hearts could scarcely be broken into subjection by a theocracy wherein God ruled almost by personal sovereignty. He made His own laws for this obdurate people and enforced them by penalties so dreadful that we cannot but shudder in reading them. Excommunication in its earliest stage seems to have been tantamount to rooting out or utter destruction; and it was only in the latter days of Judaism, when the theocratic government had in great part disappeared under kingly rule, or rather after the return from Babylon, that we find the first traces of that milder form of separation from the assembly of believers which is the basis of Christian excommunication.

This is mentioned in Esdras x. 8, where certain offenders, besides forfeiting their substance, were to be "cast out of the com-

pany of those that had returned from the captivity." And yet more explicitly in the New Testament (John ix. 22; xii. 42), where the form of punishment reads, "to be put out of the synagogue," or as the Vulgate has it, "fieri extra synagogam, e synagoga ejici." We shall not enter into any detailed account of the Talmudic forms of excommunication that are used by the modern synagogue. They are only a development of the practice that prevailed among the Jews after deliverance from the bondage of Babylon, and which we find remaining down to the time of Our Lord. The form is three-fold, the Niddui, the Hherem and the Shammatah, the first mentioned being the mildest and the last the most severe form of excommunication. It is perhaps more of a fancy than a fact that there is allusion to the three forms in Our Saviour's words: "Blessed shall you be, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you and shall reproach you and cast out your name as evil" (Luke vi. 22). It may appear singular that the *Hherem* should be now counted one of the milder forms of excommunication, whereas its earlier meaning was *anathema*, a thing devoted or doomed to destruction. It was applied to persons and things, and all so doomed had to perish by fire or the sword. Hence the causative form of *Hharam* is simply rendered (without allusion to the devoting or anathema) by *kill* or *utterly destroy*. Yet the primitive meaning of *Hharam* seems to have been analogous to the roots of Niddui and Shammatha. It meant to shut up and keep from common use. From this the transition to devoting a person or thing to sacred purposes and to destruction is easy. We have both in the Roman phrases: "Minervæ sacrum" and "Diis Infernis Sacer Esto."

The practice of excommunication was introduced into the primitive Church, like all her leading points of discipline, by the Apostles. But they did not assume this power to themselves of their own choice, much less of their own caprice. This was reserved, as we shall see later on, for men who ran where they were not sent, and founded churches of their own in opposition to God's true and only Church. In this, as in everything else, the Apostles were *docibiles Dei*, taught of God. They had received from their Divine Master the power of binding as well as of loosing; and they exercised it in obedience to Him who had made them His representatives and partakers of His right to govern the Church. It was natural, in view of human pride and frailty, that some refractory spirits would change or contradict their teaching and refuse "to hear the Church." These, by command of Christ, were to be cast out and have their portion with the heathen and the publican (Matth. xviii. 17). If they made shipwreck of their own faith, they must not be allowed to taint the faith of others with the

gangrene of heresy. They were to be handed over to Satan that they might learn not to blaspheme (1 Tim. i. 20).

If another scandalized the community by enormous wickedness of life, such "evil one" was to be "taken away" by excommunication from amongst the Christian people (1 Cor. v. 5, 13). He was, by the power of the Lord Jesus and His Apostle, to be delivered to Satan for the destruction of his flesh (*Ibid.*). God would reserve to His own judgment offenders who were without the pale, but perverse teachers and evil doers among the faithful were to be dealt with by the authority of the Apostles and their successors (*Ibid.*). Yet this authority was to be exercised in no vindictive spirit. It was a punishment, but meant as a remedy. Their flesh was destroyed, but only that their spirit might be saved on the great day of the Lord. If they were given over to Satan, the anger of their mother, the Church, was only inspired by anxiety and hope, that they might cease to blaspheme, be converted and live (1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 20). Whoever would not hear and obey the Apostle was not to be counted an enemy. He was to be admonished as a brother, and if he refused to submit to correction he was to be marked and shunned, in order that he might be brought to a salutary sense of shame (2 Thess. iii., 14, 15).

And this has always been the practice as well as the teaching of the Church, as expounded by her great doctors and theologians in every age from Saints Cyprian, Augustine and Chrysostom down to Benedict XIV. of almost our own day. The latter sums up the universal teaching in these words: "Let Church censures be inflicted only with caution and moderation" (*Sobrie et circumspecte ferantur.* De Synodo Diœc. Lib. x., Cap. I.). One may be disposed to think that, in certain periods of Church history, prelates, abbots and other spiritual rulers have made too lavish a use of ecclesiastical censures. But such judgments are too often the result of hasty, superficial reading. The more closely and accurately one considers the circumstances of the times, and the rough character of the subjects who then fell under ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the more occasion he will find not only to excuse, but to applaud their conduct. As a rule, their use of spiritual weapons was the only means left them to protect the poor and oppressed and to hinder spoliation and sacrilege. Even if some of them failed in their duty of observing the "*sobrie et circumspecte*," as the great Pontiff phrases it, their mistake was their own, and may be judged by the rules of history. It never can be pleaded in denial of the general spirit and teaching of the Church.

Those who are most given to blame the misuse of the excommunicating power in the Catholic Church, and who are ever harping on individual cases to excite sectarian odium or ridicule

(Voltaire's favorite weapon), are generally[1] members of churches that hate and despise the old Christian Church of nineteen centuries, but would feel deeply offended if their claim to be Christian churches (though of modern birth) were denied or even called in question. Yet these good men seem either to know or care little for what may be retorted against their own churches, in which the right of excommunication was so often unjustly claimed and unjustly exercised. Indeed, the history of excommunication in the two principal Protestant communions, Lutheran and Calvinist, seems to be little known or not considered worthy of the student's attention. Yet it would prove a very interesting chapter in the religious philosophy of the human mind, and would wonderfully and fearfully illustrate how easily spiritual bondage can be made to coexist with the persuasion and boast of unlimited religious freedom. Our limits make it impossible to attempt more than a faint outline of the introduction and abuse of this excommunicating power in the so-called Reformed churches.

In Luther's "Table-Talk"[2] there is a good-sized chapter of some eleven or twelve folio pages on excommunication. The intelligent reader can only see in it a disjointed rhapsody of dogmatism, self-sufficiency, abuse of his disciples and fellow-religionists, alternating with curses against the Pope and outbursts of indignation and despair in beholding the wretched moral condition to which the "New Gospel" had reduced Germany. He asserts, of course, as confidently as if he were one of the Twelve, that the power of binding and loosing belongs to himself and his fellow-ministers. He maintains that the precept of avoiding all sinners, not even eating with them or giving them friendly greeting, is an unchangeable decree of God's majesty, which binds the Church forever, and which no man has power to alter or neglect. He boasts of how he had punished some sinners by putting them under the ban, though he elsewhere admits that no minister has the right to undertake singly this duty. These sinners, however, seem to have

---

[1] Not all of them, however. Those who have made a study of Catholic doctrine and history know full well what bold, bad opinions in this matter of excommunication were held and taught by the Van Espens and other canonists and theologians of the Jansenist faction, who pretended to be Catholics in spite of the Pope and the Church, that had by solemn decision cast them out of her communion. Another more recent fact is recorded by Bp. England. A Catholic layman, who was an adherent of the excommunicated priest, William Hogan, acknowledged to the Bishop, not in any spirit of repentance, but with unblushing assurance, that it was he who had given to the Philadelphia press the "Tristram Shandy" form, as the genuine sentence of excommunication pronounced on the wretched priest by Bp. Conwell (Bp. England's Works. Baltimore: J. Murphy & Co., 1849. Vol. v., p. 115).

[2] Colloquia oder Tischreden Doctor Martini Lutheri. Durch Herrn Johann Aurifaber Gedruckt zu Franckfurt am Mayn, 1567, fo. Ch. xxi., Von der Excommunication und Bann, oder der Kirchen Jurisdiction.

been people of low degree; for when it comes to squires, "Hof-Junckers" and nobles, he thinks the ban cannot be ventured on. He repeats incessantly that the law of excommunication ought to be reëstablished, but cannot see his way. The jurists and nobles will not allow it; the people are against it. They do not like to see it enforced against others for fear it might be enforced against themselves. The authorities ought to help the execution of Church censures. But they will not do it, and are not God's servants, but slaves of the Devil in Hell. He falls back on the consoling thought that his New Gospel Christians by being sinners excommunicate themselves, and therefore need not be put under any ban.[1] But the old cry of despair comes back to him, that it is useless to hope that men will endure the yoke to which (thanks to Gospel freedom) they have been so long unaccustomed. Every one will have his own way, and such wanton wickedness is visibly growing every day. All he can do is to long for the last day to put an end to this wretched, devilish state of things.[2]

It would take a volume and more to reproduce Luther's confessions, complaints and inconsolable groanings over the abyss of moral corruption for which Germany (nor did he attempt to disguise it) was indebted to his "New Gospel." And as many more would be needed to record his repeated longings for the last day, in which he saw the only remedy for the horrible evils brought about by Gospel freedom and its abuse by the great majority. He had fancied that to restore excommunication would prove a check to the growing wickedness of his converts; but he was soon undeceived, if indeed there had been any sincerity or earnestness in his purpose. The great crowd of adulterers, drunkards, usurers, oppressors of the poor and Epicureans, as he himself called them, who cared nothing for God or their soul, and could only boast that Gospel light had set them free from all moral obligation, had grown so numerous and powerful, that they could well afford to laugh at threats of excommunication or other attempts to enforce Church discipline. Besides, his unworthy condescensions to princely sinners in Saxony and Hesse had made him no longer a fit authority to rebuke sin amongst high or low.

Hereupon the Saxon "Reformer"—seeing that Papal excom-

[1] "Unser Wucherer, Seuffer, Schwelger, Hurentreiber, Lesterer unnd Spötter dürffen wir nicht in Bann thun, sie thun sich selbs in Bann, ja sind allbereit darinne bis uber die Ohren" (We give the quaint old spelling). He continues: Well, then, since they will not be Christians, let them be heathens. . . . . Let them get no absolution, be present at no baptism, no marriage, no burial; let them count themselves heathens, as they are by choice. Let no parish priest, no chaplain attend them when dying, and when dead let the hangman toss them into a carrion pit. (Fo. 230.) And yet the very next paragraph begins: "We must again establish excommunication," and the reason given is that "we have not thoroughly pressed it up to this time."

[2] *Ibid.*, fo. 229.

munication and its beneficial effects[1] were hopelessly gone, and that the Protestant pulpit could never become its successor or substitute in stemming the torrent of iniquity amongst his followers —was filled with just indignation, for which it is only fair to give him credit. But instead of studying out the causes of his disappointment, and retracing his steps accordingly, he yielded to another temptation. His books and pamphlets had hitherto done him great service; but in this line of work he soon found rivals not only among Catholics, but amongst his inquiring disciples, with whom the charm of the "αυτος εφα" had begun to lose its magical power. They, too, could write and print and with coarse speech, witty sarcasm or logical argument produce ridicule or conviction amongst the daily-growing crowd of learned and semi-learned readers. The pulpit, in which his impetuous, irresistible eloquence carried all before it, in which he could play at will demagogue, inspired teacher and prophet, was exclusively his own, his judgment-seat and throne. Here no rival could intrude; here he could successfully approve or condemn, knowing that his audience came not to examine or doubt, but only "to swear by the master's words." He would use it in future for his personal ends. If it could no longer heal sinners, it could be made a means to hurt his enemies and maintain his own supremacy. It was a dishonest, desperate resolve, but what else could be expected from a man of his ungovernable pride and passion, and who felt that he was no longer the great Luther of Worms and Augsburg, but that (to use his own language) those whom he had rescued from the Pope's tyranny were trying to step into his place and had become his worst enemies?

He stuck to his purpose, and from that day mercilessly pursued and anathematized from his preaching-desk every one who presumed to differ with him, or against whom he had a grudge. Jurists, Jews, Zwinglians, Catholics, and even his own friends and followers who would not make themselves sharers in his personal hatred and quarrels to the extent he demanded—all fell indiscriminately under the ban of his foul tongue. He spared not even the dead.

Having occasion to preach in Halle on "the Conversion of St. Paul," he wanders repeatedly away from his subject to the coarsest

[1] When Luther denounced and cursed the excommunication of Catholic times, he was talking for effect rather than from conviction. In his letter (Nov. 22d, 1526) to his prince and protector, John, Elector of Saxony (in addressing whom there was no need of disguise), he acknowledged that the Pope's excommunication was a salutary check, especially upon the lower class of country people. But now that it existed no more, there was no longer any wholesome fear or discipline. Every one did as he pleased. "The country people lived like hogs," etc. (De Wette, Luther's Briefe, vol. iii., p. 136).

abuse of the Pope, the monks, and above all of Cardinal Albert of Brandenburg, Elector of Mayence, only four months dead, and to whose jurisdiction Halle was subject. Here are some of his choice phrases: "The damned Cardinal Bishop of Mayence, your former Bishop and Prince, ... tried to lead us by the nose and deceive us, to rob us of the dear Word of God and get our money . . . . I wonder how you, gentlemen (the Senate or Council) of Halle, can yet stand these rascals, these scabby, lousy monks, who keep on blaspheming God and his Word, the wicked, lousy villains who delight in the mocking mummeries of the damned Cardinal. . . . . And these scabby monks hope to bring back the same things again, and to seduce more souls; so did the Cardinal, and he will find it out in Hell. . . . . The Pope knows that he is wrong, and so did your Cardinal Bishop of Mayence, but like the Pope he took delight in fooling and mocking folks. . . . . Were I to tell the Cardinal: you are doing wrong in fooling the people, he would say: yes, I know it quite well (as indeed your Cardinal did know it thoroughly well), but I will have it so and not otherwise. For which (rejoins Luther) may you get your thanks from the Devil in Hell."[1] What a contrast this abuse of the pulpit presents to Luther's own declaration, made thirteen years before in a treatise written against George Duke of Saxony, in which he says: "It is a damnable vice, of which even Pagans would be ashamed, to speak evil of the dead, especially by name. He is little better than a jackal or cannibal, whose angry soul wreaks its hatred on the dead."[2] Evidently St. Paul's conversion was only a handle, the true object being to "wreak his hatred" on the dead Cardinal, and to urge the Senate to drive out the monks. Had they been "rascals and villains" there would have been no need to call for their expulsion. They would have been already in the foremost rank of the new converts, like Lange, Bucer, Melander, Lening, etc.

But, perhaps, one of the most shameful and unprovoked of all his pulpit utterances was his solemn denunciation, indeed we may call it excommunication,[3] of the poet Simon Lemnius in the year 1538, because he had dared to praise the same Cardinal as a patron of literature. That Albert of Mayence was such, was known to all Germany. He had befriended Erasmus, Hutten (Luther's warmest adherent), and a host of other humanists, poets and artists. How natural that a poet, like Lemnius, should sing the praises of his Mæcenas! Besides, his Lutheran orthodoxy was beyond suspicion.

---

[1] Luther's Sämmtliche Werke, Erlangen ed. vol. xvi. pp. 124, 126, 133.

[2] Erlang. ed. xxxiii. 304.

[3] So Döllinger (with others) calls it: "Er las auf der Kanzel eine art von Bannformel gegen ihn vor."

Had he not printed in this very year (1538) at Wittemberg a licentious pasquinade against Popery and the religious orders, the very title of which betrays its flagitious character, and which no doubt Luther had both read and relished? But to praise Albert of Brandenberg, whom Luther hated as a personal enemy,—and in his own town of Wittemberg,—was a crime beyond pardon, a "sin unto death." And to make matters worse, the book in question (a volume of Latin epigrams) had been favorably passed on by Melanchthon, who was public censor and whom Luther was then beginning to suspect of waning allegiance, and of too close relations with the Sacramentarians and Zwinglians of Zurich, Geneva and Strasburg. His son-in-law, George Sabinus, was known to be a great admirer of Cardinal Albert.

The indignation of Luther knew no bounds. It fell not upon Melanchthon, whose loss the "Reformer" and the University could not afford, but upon Lemnius and his book. An edict of arrest was procured from the court, but the poet, warned in time, fled away to Coire in Switzerland, and thus escaped perpetual imprisonment, if not death, which Luther considered the proper penalty for his crime![1] The fugitive was denounced and banned by a solemn decree drawn up by Luther and read by himself from the pulpit, on Sunday, June 16, of that year. It is a characteristic document, and did our space allow ought to be given in full as a sample of his pulpit-banning on mere personal grounds. It is addressed "to all the brethren and sisters of our Church here in Wittemberg," and begins with vituperation of the "downright infamous, scandalous, lying book" of epigrams, which a rascally knave, Simon Lemnius by name, has published without the knowledge and against the will of the regular censors. (This bit of irony is meant for Melanchthon, whose intimacy with Lemnius was well known). All right-minded Christians are entreated and exhorted, for the honor of our Holy Gospel, to make away with and burn these blasphemous poems.

"Moreover (he continues), since this vile ballad-monger praises the abominable town-clerk of Halle, or (by your leave) Bishop Albert, and makes a saint out of the Devil, I cannot allow this to be done openly and in print in this church, school and city, because this filthy bishop is a man of falsehood and lying."[2]

[1] "Dadurch er nach allen Rechten, wo der flüchtige Bube becommen wäre, billig den Kopf verloren hätte." Decree read from the Wittemberg pulpit (Seidemann, Luther's Briefe, Berlin, 1856, vol. vi. p. 199).

[2] "Zudem, weil derselbige Schandpoetaster den leidigen Stadt-schreiber zu Halle, mit Urlaub zu reden, Bischof Albrecht, lobet und einen Heiligen aus dem Teufel machet, ist mirs nicht zu leiden dass solchs öffentlich und durch den Druck geschehe in dieser Kirchen, Schule und Stadt, weil derselbige Scheissbischof ein falscher, verlogener Mann ist." (Ibid. p. 200).

He concludes: "Once more, I beg all our people and especially the poets and hypocrites, henceforth not to praise nor cry up publicly the vile, worthless priest in this church, school and city. Otherwise they and their master had better look out for what I will do against them. Let them know that I will not allow this self-damned, reprobate priest, who would like to see us all dead, to be praised here in Wittemberg."[1] Was ever such shameless, arrogant language uttered from a Catholic pulpit in any age, by any excommunicating prelate or Pontiff? To hide his personal resentment, he gave out that Lemnius had covertly attacked in his epigrams some professors of Wittemberg, and even the Elector. No one believed it then, much less does any one believe it now. When the princes, Catholic and Protestant, of the house of Brandenburg (to which Albert belonged) complained of this outrage, and the Elector rebuked Luther, the latter in his letter of excuse to the Prussian margrave never dreams of this contemptible subterfuge. He speaks of the document, as it really was, directed not against Lemnius, but against Albert of Brandenburg. "Dass sich E. F. G. so hart annehmen des zedels (zettels) *wider den Bischof zu Mainz* ausgangen,"[2] etc. The entire innocence of Lemnius has been established by the famous Lessing, and yet more fully by Strobel at the close of the last century.[3]

Nor was it against Catholic princes only that he hurled his thunders. It is well-known how he spoke and wrote of the royal founder of the Anglican Church. He would not spare even the relatives of his own sovereign. Angered by the attitude of the Protestant duke, Maurice of Saxony, towards the Smalkaldic league, he invented against him a novel form of excommunication, which consisted in praying to death the offender. "I am a prophet (he would say to his friends), and Duke Maurice must perish. This year we must pray Duke Maurice to death, must strike him dead with our prayers, for he will prove a wicked man."[4] Does not this remind the reader of the same formula used from the Presbyterian

---

[1] "Und bitte abermal alle die unsern, und sonderlich die Poeten oder seine Heuchler, wollten hinfurt den schändlichen Scheisspfaffen öffentlich nicht loben noch rühmen in diesser Kirchen, Schule und Stadt. Wo nicht, so mügen sie auch sammt ihrem Herrn gewarten, was ich dawider thun werde, und wissen dass ich nichts leiden will dass man den von sich selbs verdammten heillosen Pfaffen, der uns alle gern todt hätte, hie zu Wittemberg lobe." (Ibid.) We have retained (not in the translation, but in the original) some fragrant flowers of Lutheran speech, just as he read them out in church to his audience and as they are yet to be found in the Wittemberg, Leipsic, Jena and other editions of his works, in Walch, Seidemann, etc.

[2] "That your Princely Grace feels so sore about the formula published *against the Bishop of Mayence*," etc. De Wette, Luther's Briefe, Berlin, 1828, vol. v. p. 123.

[3] See Karl A. Menzel, Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen, Breslau, 1816, vol. xi. p. 191, and Seidemann, *loc. cit.*

[4] From MSS. sources apud Döllinger, Reformation, vol. iii., p. 266.

pulpit against Mary Tudor? When the preacher Libius of Eisleben had put the Protestant Count Albert of Mansfeld under the ban in such a way that the Count accused him of stirring up the people to revolt, Luther took up the cudgels on behalf of Libius and declared the accusation unjust, because (even were the ban the result of a mistake) the preacher did not encourage revolt, but in censuring the morals of these big Jacks (der grossen Hansen) only did his duty.[1]

The jurists and other officials who administered church law in Wittemberg, and throughout Saxony, were as hateful to him as if they were Catholics or Papal commissioners. He extended his spite and ill-will to the whole legal profession. He said that they must, of necessity, be ignorant men and bad Christians. They ought to be the Pope's slaves, since they held to his Canon Law —the public law of mediæval Europe. Very few of them could hope for salvation. Had he ten sons, he would allow none of them to study law. In what were lawyers any better than tailors and cobblers? Since their profession consisted in setting people by the ears, he often wondered that God did not destroy the world because of their wickedness. Such proud dunces and pettifoggers ought to have their tongues torn out of their throats (man solte solchen stolzen tropffen und Rabulen die zunge auss dem Halse reissen."[2] Amongst the rhyming proverbs he most loved to quote were these: "Alle Juristen, Sind böse Christen," and

> "Omnis Jurista
> Aut est Nequista
> Aut Ignorantista."

But he was not content to pursue the hateful tribe merely in private letters, pamphlets and books, at the dinner-tables of his friends or the festive conviviality of the Black Eagle. He denounced and banned and damned them from the pulpit, as representative of the Good Shepherd. The allusion is his own, as we shall see. Two years before his death (on Sunday, January 7, 1544), roused to the highest pitch of indignation by a decision of the church law-court against his wishes, in the marriage case of Gaspar Beyer, he attacked the jurists or lawyers of the ecclesiastical court. "Never could I have imagined," he said, "that after thirty years' preaching of the Gospel and writing so much, from which even a jurist might have learned something, that we should yet have among us at Wittemberg such coarse, nasty lawyers, who want to bring in again the Papacy, for their hearts are with the Pope and

[1] Luther's Works, Erlangen ed., vol. lxiv. p. 293.

[2] Tischreden, by Aurifaber, Frankfort, fo. 520. See the whole chapter (lxii.) "Von Juristen," in the same volume, ff. 514–530.

with Mayence" (gut Päpistisch und Mainzisch—a fling at Cardinal Albert of Brandenburg, who was yet living). "Well, then! since they will not hold Dr. Pommer for a bishop of this church, nor me for their preacher, they shall not belong to this church; I will not count them as my sheep, for they hear not my voice; but will drive them out by a hole in the door. If they wish to be of the Pope's hypocrites and fanatical crew, let them be so, and leave our church in peace. . . . . I will not allow them to make trouble in MY church, and perplex consciences with their dirty law. . . . . They think to sneak in again with the Pope, and to please the Bishop of M. (Maintz, Mayence). Well, since they will not hold us for bishops and parish-priests, we must not be ashamed, but hold and declare them to be Papists and children of the devil."[1]

Having thus scourged, or "washed the hide" (as he playfully expresses it) of the jurists, he comes to the sore point which had provoked him to handle the matter in the pulpit, viz., the secret betrothals, forbidden by himself and allowed by the jurists. "Therefore I, Dr. Martin, in the name of our Lord God, command that no one shall be secretly betrothed, and then, after it is done, shall ask the parents' consent, to cover up and palliate such infamy and wickedness. And, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I damn to the depths of Hell all abettors and helpers of such Devil's work. Amen."[2] The aiders and abettors are, of course, the lawyers, against whom principally, if not solely, the excommunication was meant. Such words might have moved princes and peoples long ago. But the day of Luther's power was gone. He scolded, stormed, and cursed, but in vain. No one contradicted him, but no one heeded or obeyed him. Well might he say that "his heart was chilled" when he saw the utter downfall of that authority, to gain which he had done so much deliberate wrong, sacrificed his conscience and imperilled (to say the least) his hopes of salvation. Whilst attempting to excommunicate others, the unhappy man forgot, or would not remember, that he, too, was under a far more terrible ban, being cut off from the Church of the living God, shut out from every grace save that which remains for the most abandoned sinner, and virtually given

---

[1] Ibid., f. 518, 519.

[2] "Darumb gebiete ich, Doctor Martinus, im Namen des Herrn unsers Gottes, dass sich niemand heimlich verlobe, unnd darnach, wens nu geschehen ist, die eltern umb Bewilligung ansuche, und also ein Schanddeckel und grund suche sein böses fürnemmen damit zubeschönen. Und verdamme im Namen des Vatters, des Sons unnd heiligen Geistes, in Abgrund der Hellen, alle die jnen anhangen und helffen solch Teufelswerck fördern. Amen." (We copy the loose and inconsistent spelling of the original.) Ibid., 520, fo. verso. All the quotations above given may be found abridged in K. A. Menzel, *op. cit.*, ii., 419, 420, in Döllinger, Reformation, iii., 270, and in other historians.

over to reprobation because of the pride which would not allow him to utter the cry for help that alone could save him.

Luther had failed in enforcing the effects of his excommunicating power, but his successors in the clerical office were not deterred by his failure. The possession of the keys for binding and loosing, which they pretended to have received from Christ, or to have justly wrested from the hands of the Old Church, now apostate and fallen, was a power which, though dormant, conferred a sort of hierarchical honor, and made an intrinsic difference between clergy and laity. Its rights might one day be fully revived; and the pastor for his village or congregation, the superintendent for all churches of the country, might again be what Hildebrand and Innocent III. had once been for the whole of Catholic Europe. It was a pleasant prospect, and some princes humored it imprudently. Thus Maurice of Saxony, in the year 1543 (by rescripts of May 21 and September 22), decreed that the ban should be enforced by civil penalties, and that banned Lutherans, if contumacious, should be expelled from his territory.[1] Had the Lutheran preachers used their power, sanctioned more or less openly by the State, against notoriously scandalous sinners, they might have done something to serve the cause of good morals, and, even under failure, retained the consoling thought that they had, at least, discharged their duty.

But the silent growth of Calvinism in Germany, confronted by an equally growing slavish reverence for Luther's memory, soon divided Germany into two hostile camps. There grew up even in rigid orthodox Lutheranism, as in the opposite faction, a fondness for speculating on dogma, and daily discoveries of new doctrine, or new theological opinions, springing from the crazy principle of deciding the sense of the Bible by private interpretation. Foremost among the new founders of theological schools were the Lutheran clergy. Their zeal and ambition having found a new channel, they gave up all care of watching over the morals of their flocks, of discipline, ban, and censure to check their evil course of living. Orthodoxy became the watchword, and as long as it was safe scandals might flourish with impunity. Every preacher would understand the Bible as he thought fit, but would not allow his neighbor to exercise the same right. Whatever he had found in his Bible, by dint of study and private interpretation, was God's Word, and to think otherwise was blasphemy, Popery, and atheism. Some of these novel opinions were of serious import—concerning the Real Presence, Predestination, Free Will. Others contained truth, but exaggerated in a way to scandalize the hearer. Others, again, were specimens of the finest theological hairsplitting, cobwebs of the brain, beyond the grasp of the congregation, and

[1] K. A. Menzel, *op. cit.*, iv., 137.

of the preacher himself. Yet, they were all taught alike as vital articles of faith, the denial or doubt of which involved banning from the pulpit; not seldom, imprisonment or other penalties; and, in all cases, death to the soul.

The discord grew to be so wide-spread that the old adage, "Quot capita tot sententiæ" was almost literally verified. Every one was alone orthodox; his neighboring preacher he charged with heresy, Popery and denial of God's word. The abusive terms of fanatic, Sacramentarian, Melanchthonian, Synergist, Papist, Idolater, Bread-worshipper, and worse, were hurled from every pulpit. Andreas, the Lutheran superintendent in Tübingen (the Lutheran Pope, as he was called by others and by himself), acknowledged, in 1576 (just thirty years after Luther's death), that, thanks to the Devil's working, there was scarcely a preacher in Germany who agreed in belief with another, or even with his own sexton.[1] The preachers excommunicated each other from the pulpit, and denounced each other as perjurers, traitors, soul-murderers, enemies of Christ, etc. They fought out their dogmatic battles not only at the church desk, but in the confessional, and at the communion table. When a deacon once refused absolution to the preacher Eggerdes, but granted it to his wife, she went back to him and told him he had better damn her as well as her husband, for she shared his theological opinion.[2]

After Luther, perhaps, the two preachers who acquired most renown (or infamy) and stirred up most trouble by banning, cursing and persecuting their enemies from the pulpit, were Flacius in Jena, and Hesshusius in Magdeburg. The former was so bitter and even brutal in propagating by books and sermons his rigid Lutheranism, that he incurred personal hatred and even persecution at the hands of the "gentle" Melanchthon and his Wittemberg friends. He had been excommunicated by his colleague, Strigel. He not only paid him back in his own coin by a counter-excommunication of himself and all who defended his orthodoxy, but had him arrested and imprisoned in the fortress of Gotha. This scandalous revenge caused such general horror that princes, and even the Catholic emperor of Germany, interceded for Strigel's liberation. The "Pope of Jena," as his Lutheran enemies called him, condescended to release him from the tower of Gotha, but kept him imprisoned in his own house. Flacius's sermons and those of his colleagues, Judex, Wigand and Musæus consisted in cursing the Adiaphorists, Schwenkfeldians, Majorists, Antinom-

[1] "Der Teufel habe es in einem Zeitraum von wenigen Jahren in diesen Ländern dahin gebracht, dass kaum mehr ein Pastor mit dem andern oder mit seinem Küster einig sei." Apud Döllinger, *op. cit.* ii., p. 379.

[2] Döllinger, Ib. p. 463.

ians, Osiandrists, Philippists (Melanchthonians), Calvinists, and other sectarians, who had improved on Luther's doctrine, making them out apostates, heretics, wolves, thieves, and children of Satan. Melanchthon's Wittemberg friends replied to him in the same tone and spirit, calling him a gallows-bird, beast, fool, ass, God's enemy, sycophant, vessel of wrath, Lutheran Pope, etc. He ought (they added) to be hung, or to make away with himself by hanging. Wigand, Judex and Musæus were poor devils, but their father Flacius was the very incarnate Devil himself.[1] The triumph of Flacius did not last long. Having been ordered by the Duke to put an end to his pulpit anathemas, he replied with a threatening letter, denouncing God's judgments on the prince, and refusing to surrender the power of the keys entrusted to him by God. This angered the Duke to such a degree that he declared he would no longer tolerate Flacius's "new Popedom and Spanish inquisition" in Jena. He sent Chancellor Bruck, a coarse drunkard (who had been for years a warm personal friend of Luther's), summarily to depose Flacius and his colleagues. And thus he was made to taste the bitter cup of persecution with which he had drenched his Lutheran enemies for so many years. He assumed the air of a martyr, and said he was glad to escape from the many tribulations and persecutions he had long suffered in the church of Jena!

The other notorious incendiary, Tileman Hesshusius,[2] thought himself called by Heaven to cleanse genuine Lutheranism from the stains and corruptions of Melanchthon and the Calvinists. Wherever he became Superintendent, in Rostock, Bremen or Magdeburg, he lorded it over his flock and fellow-preachers, cursing from the pulpit the latter, when presuming to differ with him, and denouncing them as night-ravens, asses, blasphemers, Melanchthonians, crypto-papists, etc. He scattered right and left, among clergy and laity, the thunders of his excommunication. Thus he punished the Governor of Rostock, Count George von Erbach, for having dared, with tears in his eyes, to recommend more concord amongst the preachers. He snatched the chalice out of the hands of his deacon Keblitz (a friend of Melanchthon), who was about to give communion, and next Sunday solemnly excommunicated him. The patience of the town-council, on whom he had inflicted the same penalty, became exhausted. They held a meeting, and notified him that he must stop all cursing and banning from the pulpit, and obey the mandate to that effect lately issued by Sigismund,

[1] "Diess soll aber alles nicht euch arme Teufel (Wigand, Judex u. A.) angehen sondern euern Vater, den leibhaftigsten Teufel, Flacius." Answer of the Wittemb. Theologians, apud Döllinger, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 235. Cf. pp. 233–234, 239–240, 245.

[2] Wolfgang Menzel says of him, "Hesshusius had all the characteristics of a dog, except fidelity." Geschicte der Deutschen bis auf die neusten Tage, Stuttgart (Cotta), 1855, vol. iii., p. 153.

Lutheran Archbishop of Halle. To this he replied publicly next Sunday before the congregation, that the proceedings in council came from drunkards who had not yet slept themselves sober. As to Sigismund's mandate, it was "blasphemous, godless, devilish and hellish." It trampled the preaching-office under foot, and, therefore, ought not to be heeded for a moment. Nor did he heed it, but even threatened the Council with major as well as minor excommunication. He thought himself too secure in popular favor to fear magistrates, who, being (he said) under the ban, were no longer counted such by him; and his fondness for pulpit-cursing grew in extent and boldness. He terrified the excommunicated with his threats that they should never get his absolution, never have his attendance, nor the sacrament in their last hour, nor Christian burial after death. These threats and counter-threats of like tenor from the pulpits of the hostile faction filled the well disposed among the laity with doubt, anxiety and consternation. Many were so bewildered by this Babel of cursing voices and jarring anathemas, that they refused to attend the churches. Others fell into sickness and habitual melancholy, others lost their senses and went raving mad. And some of these wicked church-tyrants had the hardihood to represent this work of their hands as an example of God's just punishment! But the evil brought its own remedy at last. Hesshusius and his noisy crew were driven from the pulpit, and he resolved to preach in the streets of Magdeburg. But his partisans abandoned him, and he was banished.[1]

The same scenes of mutual fighting, banning and cursing were witnessed in every city of Lutheran Germany, where there was a split in serious doctrine, or even in subtle opinion, between the preachers. Thus it was, not to go over them all, with the interchange of anathemas between Osiander and Mörlin, in Königsberg, who damned each other and their hearers so fiercely and in such horrible terms, that husbands and wives, parents and children began to hold each other in mutual abhorrence. "Better (said Mörlin from the pulpit) that you should wade knee deep in blood, better that the Turk should come and murder you all, better that you should be Jews or Pagans, than allow this" (viz., that you and your children should hear Osiander). "I have warned you. Whoever will not take the warning, let him go to the Devil. I need not hand them over to Satan, they are his already. . . . You must not give them greeting, or consort with them, but avoid them as if they were the very Devil."[2] Such, too, was the case with Ketzmann, in Anspach, who poured out fiery invective and anathema against his colleague Karg; and with the preachers of Mansfeld,

[1] See Menzel, *op. cit.*, W., 308–313; Döllinger, *loc. cit.*, 462–463.

[2] Karl Adolph Menzel, *op. cit.*, iv., 420–421.

who condemned and banished George Major for daring to teach that good works were necessary for salvation.[1] Major took refuge with his friend Melanchthon, who pitied him as an unjustly persecuted man. But the fact is that in arrogance and blackguardism (it is the only fitting word) Major was not a whit behind his enemies and was a rival of Luther himself.[2] In Bremen, Hardenberg, with all his hearers, was banned and given over to the Devil by Tiemann and Hesshusius, his adherents deposed from office and imprisoned, and himself finally banished. When Musæus, another preacher, wished to renew the ban, the town council objected to the measure, whereupon Musæus exclaimed it was a damnable and intolerable act of insubordination for the authorities to interfere with the church and dictate to the preachers. It was very strange that the theory and practice of excommunication so gloriously established in Magdeburg and Brunswick, in Mansfeld, Anhalt, Schleswig, Holstein, and Denmark, should be objected to in Bremen. No matter what danger, noise or tumult came of excommunication, or whether it hurt friends and relatives; it was enough that it rescued souls from the wrath of the Devil."[3]

But the abuse of the pulpit ban took a wider range than the proscription of theological opinion, or the avenging of private wrongs. The Lutheran preachers soon began to take part not only in court intrigues and the petty squabbles of noble families, but also in State politics. And here, as their leading motive was the success of the theological faction to which they belonged or other private interest,—not Christian principles of truth and justice,—they took up or threw aside party allegiance as it suited them, without shame or hesitation. It was seldom, if ever, that they were found on the side of liberty, of the people, the poor or the oppressed; they clung to the party that was in power, the party mostly always of tyranny and high-handed wrong. To it they lent the aid of their ministry, their pulpit, their anathemas. With the help of doubtful text and wicked gloss they encouraged and applauded judicial murder and embittered the last hours of political victims, as they were led to a lingering, painful death, by sermons on the stoning and burning of Achan. We have no space to quote examples of this. One will suffice, that of Hennig Brabant, a popular leader in Brunswick during the strife between patricians and people, who atoned for his patriotism by death (September 17th, 1604). The Lutheran clergy, who at first had sided with his purpose, turned against him when he failed, and compassed his death

[1] Döllinger, ii., 163; Menzel, iv., 28, 73.

[2] See his sermon delivered at Wittemberg, October 13, 1557, and condensed by Menzel (iv., 28), from Salig. We dare not transcribe it, even in the original.

[3] Menzel, iv., 123–129.

by unceasing calumny, by unworthy artifices, such as forging supernatural appearances and accusing him of having made a bargain with the Devil. He and his associates were shamefully and cruelly tortured before execution; and the preacher, Wagner, ushered in the final scene by an unctuous sermon in St. Catharine's church on the just punishment of Achan (Josue, vii. 25).[1]

Such is the history, briefly sketched (that could be swelled into volumes), of excommunication in the church that pretended to have come on earth to abolish the tyranny of Popery over the human soul and conscience. We are quite willing that any impartial judge should compare the value of her claim to the possession of this power, and the way in which she wielded it, with the claims of the Old Church and the spirit in which she used such power—and decide accordingly. The preachers of a church whose watch-word is freedom of religious thought, steal this sacred weapon from the armory of the Catholic Church, against which they have indignantly rebelled, and use it to crush free thought, to punish dissent not only from their creed, but even from their ever-shifting vagaries of theological opinion. They boldly lord it over both worlds, and usurp the right to punish such dissent by loss of spiritual favors and sacraments in this life, and by eternal damnation in the next. Under the title of God's representatives, they construe every personal slight as an insult to God's majesty, and with this pretext gratify their rancor and hate by dooming their enemies to hell. They ban and curse from their pulpits for political offences, encouraging the oppressor and bearing down yet more heavily on his bleeding victims, by adding to his civil penalties the terrors of anathema and everlasting flames. And all this is done, not by solemn deliberation in synods, consistories and other high places of church authority, but by individual caprice—each village pastor holding that his pulpit ministry confers on him the supreme power of the Keys of Heaven.

How different is excommunication in the Catholic Church! She speaks in the words and with the authority of St. Paul, because she is the lineal descendant of the Apostles. Any individual priest may, when duly commissioned, administer the sacraments and preach; but this gives him no right to excommunicate. This she has reserved to her highest authorities, bishops, councils and

[1] There is a full account in Menzel, v. 229–235. As a characteristic item in the history of legal torture in those days of barbarous jurisprudence, one may read there how Zachary Druseman while undergoing torture was left hanging on the rack that his judges might adjourn to another room to partake of a supper of wine and comfits. As they delayed their return, Druseman implored the executioner by the wounds of our dying Lord to lower him a little and ease, were it ever so little, the pressure of the screws. He replied that he dared not do it without orders. The judges were absent a full hour and came back, quite drunk, to find that their victim had expired under his torments.

the Pope. And her rule and practice is that neither private resentment, nor court favor, nor worldly politics can be just ground for pronouncing anathema on offenders. In the very darkest period of her history, when excommunications abounded most, all of them, almost without exception, were issued to protect the poor and helpless, and to terrify and subdue their oppressors. And even if now and then there was found a possible case where excommunication was neither timely nor prudent, it needs only a little good taste and good sense to conclude that (should there be no other alternative) it were far better to be at the mercy of great, holy, high-minded men like the Gregories, Innocents and Clements, than to be daily subject to the wicked caprices of such petty, foul-mouthed demagogues and unscrupulous spiritual tyrants as Luther, Flacius, Hesshusius, Westphalus, Mörlin, Osiander, and the like.

After devoting so much space to Luther and the Lutheran clergy, it might seem almost unfair to pass over Calvin and his followers in Geneva and Scotland. But our space is limited. It is enough to state that Calvin spoke by the mouth of Farel, when the latter asserted that excommunication was of the very essence of the ministry, and to doubt it was worse than stupid, for it implied a doubt whether Christ should be heard in the Church.[1] It was the great lever by which he sought and attained his politico-religious dictatorship in Geneva.[2] He used it not only to carry out his weighty changes in church and state, and punish his enemies political and religious[3]; but to avenge the most trifling slights that no man of sense or dignity would notice; in other words, to make excommunication subserve and defend his unbounded pride and vanity.[4] There were 414 such trifling cases visited with church censures in the two years 1558 and 1559. To impugn his doctrine, or in any way attack the proceedings of his consistory, endangered life. When reproached with this harsh, unchristian conduct, he answered, with unsufferable pride and blasphemy, that he was imitating the prophets, apostles, Christ and the Holy Ghost, who had treated their enemies "with bitterness!"[5] Such value did he set on this power of excommunication that he resolved, if he were deprived of it, forthwith to abandon Geneva.[6]

---

[1] Life of Calvin by Thomas H. Dyer (English Protestant). London: (Murray). 1850. P. 484. The conscience of Calvin and Farel must have winced while one was writing, the other approving, these words. For the Church of Berne, with which both were in close communion, did not admit this discipline. But as the Swiss Calvinist, Ruchat, says, with the approval of Dyer: This is one of the cases in which Calvin used two weights and two measures.

[2] Ibid., p. 65.

[3] In the Perrin affair, two modern historians, Galiffe and Thourel, who had explored the archives of Geneva, charge him with personal hatred, which could be appeased only by the blood of his enemies. Ibid., 397.

[4] Ibid., p. 144. [5] Ibid. [6] Ibid., p. 372.

All or nearly all the Reformed (non-Lutheran) churches recognize the divine right of excommunication. Berne was made an exception, thanks to Bullinger. Most of them profess this in their creeds. Thus the creeds of Zurich, the Belgic and the two Swiss Confessions. The Scotch Confession deals no further with the subject than by stating that "in our Kirk our Ministers tak publick and particular examination of the knowledge and conversation of sik (such) as are to be admitted to the Table of the Lord." But this is supplemented by the Westminster Confession, which acknowledges the right of "suspension from the Sacrament and excommunication from the Church," though this power is rather vaguely committed to "the officers" of the church, whereas others explicitly forbid individuals to do this unless the consent of the church be obtained. Most of these confessions, especially the Presbyterian, take good care to lay down in full the duty of magistrates to root out and punish all error and superstition, in other words, their pet doctrine of persecution. All this has been altered, of course, in the American form of the creed, which teaches that "it is the duty of magistrates to protect the church *without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest.*"[1] For many this change exists only on paper, and the events of the last few weeks show that there are many amongst us who lack only the power, not the bad will, to carry out to the fullest extent both spirit and letter of the Westminster Confession. The Anglican church in the thirty-second of her thirty-nine articles allows excommunication, by which the sinner is "cut off from the unitie of the Church and is to be taken of the faythfull as an Heathen and Publicane." But how could they dare excommunicate the temporal and spiritual head of their church? Jeremy Taylor makes bold to say that communion ought to be refused to any king who leads a wicked, scandalous life. But with that happy facility for self-contradiction which characterizes all Anglican theologians, a few lines afterwards he flatly affirms that, if the Prince ask for communion, all the bishop can do is "to pray, weep and cheerfully administer it."[2]

It may be well to say a word or two on the form and the effects of excommunication. As to the former no special formula is necessary. It is sufficient that competent authority intimate it to the sinner and to those amongst whom he lives. And this was the

---

[1] American Revision of the Westminster Conf., Ch., xxiii., § 3.

[2] Ductor Dubitantium, Book iii., Ch. iv., apud Bingham, Antiquities. Not having an English copy of Bingham, we have to use the Latin translation of John Henry Grischow, a Lutheran divine, of Halberstadt. Taylor's words are, "Orare, flere et libenter ministrare." Jos. Binghami Origines sive Antiquit. Eccles. Halæ, 1729, vol. vii., p. 145.

simple form used in the early Church. The delinquent, whether self-willed heretic or incorrigible sinner, was expelled from the communion of the Church, and the faithful were notified to the end that they might avoid him. The words of St. Paul in regard to the incestuous Corinthian, to Hymenæus and Alexander (see 1 Tim., i., 20), are very brief and pointed. The culprit is merely driven from the Church, and handed over to Satan, with whom and with whose children he has cast his lot. This simple form, or its equivalent, lasted for many centuries—in fact as long as the Church had to deal with cultured peoples, such as those of Greece, Asia Minor and Syria in the East, or with the settled populations of Italy, Gaul, Spain and Northern Africa in the West. But with the irruption of the barbarians there came a great change in human society and a corresponding change in the relations of the Church to her children, of whom the new comers became, by conversion, the majority. They had become Christians, it is true, but much remained of their old barbarous nature. What had suited the more refined perception of the Greek and Italian or the Roman colonist of Gaul, was ill-adapted to untamed children of the forest, as were the nations of the North. Hence, the formulas of excommunication in the Church grew in vigor and length as they grew in number and in rigor.

For, when these northern barbarians, under the varied names of Vandal, Frank, Teuton, Norman, Longobard, etc., had occupied the whole of western Europe, infused their spirit everywhere, and stamped upon it the impress of their manners, habits of life and institutions, it became a matter of absolute necessity that there should be a new ecclesiastical polity and a thorough change of penitential discipline. And the Church, who like her great Apostle "becomes all to all, that she may gain all to Christ," wisely and gradually made the needed alteration, for the sake of her new children. By the training of centuries in their frozen northern homes, they had preserved their natural goodness and ranked far above the moral type of degenerate Greek and Roman. They were disposed to believe firmly and to show by outward life their religious belief, to imitate whatever they saw of good and to revere all that was holy. They were, however, but children of a larger growth, and had to be treated and disciplined as such. Moreover, they were rough, stiff-necked, overbearing, violent men with whom gentleness and courtesy were but other names for cowardice. Again, they had an irresistible propensity to trample on the weak; to harry, rob and outrage those whose sex or state of life left them defenceless, women and clergymen; in a word, to assert in practice the *jus fortioris*, the right that is born of might. It is well to praise the virtues of extinct generations, but it is also just and (to understand

Church history) necessary to recall the faulty character and evil deeds of those men, the

Duri ed alpestri avi,

(as the poet[1] well calls them), rugged, unbending, terrible as those dangerous mountain heights around which so many of them had their birth-place and their home.

How was the Church, without sword or buckler, to deal with such men? How was she to enforce respect and obedience to her laws, to insure for her weaker children protection from these men whose hands were ever ready for violence, rapine and bloodshed? She did the only thing that remained for her to do. She appealed to them through their faith, which was lively and solid, through their imagination and senses, by which they were enthralled. She held over their heads her spiritual weapons, of which the most formidable was the sword of excommunication. To threaten them in general terms that they were removed from fellowship with the Christian Church, might have no great effect. But to have piled upon their heads in detail the dreadful curses of the Mosaic law and of the Psalmist, the maledictions that fell on Core, Dathan and Abiron in the Old and on Judas in the New law; to be cursed by each high rank, singly and by name, of the heavenly court; to be cursed in each and every power of the mind and member of the body; to be avoided by all as a moral leper; to forfeit the intercourse of friends and family, even of wife and child; to be shut out from witnessing the Holy Mysteries or taking part, even as a listener, in the prayers of the Church; to live in lonely sorrow and then die under the curse of God and His Church—all this was sufficient to strike terror and dismay into the boldest, most obdurate soul. For many it was quite necessary; since nothing else could induce them to give up their ill-gotten prey, recall a deserted consort, break off an adulterous or otherwise forbidden marriage, or put a stop to hostile incursions with fire and sword for purposes of revenge or plunder. For, it must not be forgotten that these baronial robbers, when they had returned safe with their booty to their mountain fastnesses, could defy the civil law; and that, the higher their title, the greater the boldness and ease with which they would repudiate a wife and take another. It was against these two crimes, especially, that most excommunications were directed. And if Europe did not turn out to be a large Bedouin camp, if marriage did not sink to the level of Turkish degradation, we owe it to the bishops and Popes of the Catholic Church, and to their sentences of excommunication.

These formulas of excommunication varied according to time

[1] Parini, La Notte.

and place. That is, there was no regular form in the Ritual or Pontifical of any one diocese which would be invariably observed. The document seems to have been prepared afresh for every occasion that arose; for, though the substance was always one and the same, the expression, and yet more the adjuncts, varied. Marculphus, who is supposed to have lived in the seventh century (though it is not so certain), compiled for reference and use a collection of formulas relating to Church law, some of which he had read in old books, others he had drawn up by his own labor. They treat of donations to the Church, to kinsmen, manumission of slaves, etc. Others added their quota to the work of Marculphus; and we have now, taking their title either from the author or place, or modern editor, the Formulæ of Iso, of Angers (Andegavenses), of Alsace, of Bignon, Sirmond, Lindenborg, Baluzius, etc., all of which may be found reprinted in the eighty-seventh volume of Migne's "Patrologia Latina" (coll. 691–954). In the formularies of Marculphus there is no form given for excommunication, nor in any of the others, except in the appendix published by Baluzius, which contains twenty forms, of which eleven contain prayers for the ordeal, whether of hot or cold water, and barley-bread, against diabolical charms (maleficia, incantationes, etc.); of the rest, containing formularies of sentences of excommunication, only three come from the pen of the compiler (Nos. xii., xiii., xiv.). The next five are historical (xv., xvi., xvii., xviii. and xix.), being the forms used by Heriveus, Archbishop of Rheims, against Count Baldwin for sacrilegious murder, against Ragenard, Count of Sens, for rapine, against Count Olibanus by Suniarius, Bishop of Elvira, for the same, and two against Arnold, Radulph and others by Salla, Bishop of Urgel, for a like crime. The twentieth we shall consider by itself.

The latter is the famous excommunication published so often by non-Catholics in England and in this country. It was first made known by Hearne, the celebrated antiquarian, about one hundred and sixty years ago.[1] Subsequently, it was reprinted in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and again copied a few years after by Rev. Laurence Sterne, of the Anglican Church, in his "Tristram Shandy," so that we cannot hold the loose clerical novelist responsible, as many have held him, for its first appearance in print. Who was the author of it? This will never be known, as the codex containing it has no name of compiler or editor. Nor is it at all certain that it was written by the anonymous compiler, or was in the codex origi-

[1] Thomas Hearne was too honest and conscientious to publish it from any sinister motive. He lived only for study and antiquarian research. The Vandalism of the early "Reformers" so shocked his feelings and predilections that it led him to contempt and hatred of their religious theories. And there is good reason to believe that before his death he was admitted into the true Church.

nally. It is too different in outward form from those he has drawn up himself or gathered from historical sources. Besides, there is something peculiar in the heading of No. xx., very unlike the other headings to those of the anonymous compiler. These are respectively headed, "How a Bishop should excommunicate," another, "Address for excommunication,"[1] another, "More terrible excommunication." But no. xx. is headed, "Another formula of excommunication, differing from the above-mentioned." This would seem to indicate either that the composer knew he was travelling out of the common road, or that the transcriber had some misgivings about what he was copying.

It seems to us as if some copyist, who had a smattering of excommunication formulas, here tried his prentice hand in the composition of a new one, just as young rhetoricians among the monks occupied themselves in writing legends of saints and martyrs, which afterwards in an ignorant age were believed to be genuine, on the sole ground that they were found in MSS. in the archives of some monastery. But modern criticism has relegated these to their proper sphere of fiction, but without fraud; and the same may happen yet to the bogus formula of this romancing copyist. Protestants hail it with a chuckle of delight, and print it with many a sneer of triumph. Catholics repel it as a forgery, and they are right. For, to attribute, knowingly, a document to one who never wrote it, is deliberate fraud; to accuse him of uttering it habitually as a legal decree, when he has never even once used it, and that for the purpose of making him odious before the world, is both calumny and forgery. And this is what non-Catholic writers are never tired of doing. If Bishop Conwell excommunicates an unworthy priest, the formula from the anonymous appendix to Marculphus is put into his mouth, and spread throughout the country as the genuine sentence of excommunication, by ignorant or malicious Protestants, and by wicked Catholics unworthy of the name. If Pius IX. reminds Victor Emmanuel that he has incurred the censures of the Holy See, this senseless curse is printed as the form by which the Pope excommunicated him. Within the last year, a priest in our own country has unhappily fallen under the censure of the Pope, and again wicked Catholics and dishonest sectarians print, with the one bad purpose, in newspapers and in pamphlet form, the curses of "Tristram Shandy" as the identical form used by Leo XIII.

But, unwilling to forego the petty advantage this stupid, naughty production of some monk's or copyist's brain seems to afford them, they keep on repeating: "Is it not found in some old MSS.?"

[1] The *Allocution*, which is yet in use before sentence is pronounced.

And, to show their learning, they add: "Was it not published by the famous Baluzius, in his appendix to the "Capitularia Regum Francorum," and republished some eighty or ninety years ago in Paris by a distinguished French historical scholar?" Grand premises, indeed! But what is the conclusion? We, too, can form our premises, and ask: "Has it not been published over and over again during the last hundred and sixty years by the non-Catholic press of England and America?" And what is the conclusion? One and the same for both questions or premises. Neither publication adds a grain of value to the document. The only difference is, that the publication in France was honest and conscientious, the work of scholars; the publication in England and America is fraud and forgery, the work of dishonest knaves, whether Catholic or Protestant. Are we to repeat again, that the mere material existence of a document is no reason, *per se*, for deciding either as to its intrinsic worth or its authorship? An unknown monk may write a silly legend, prayer, adjuration, exorcism, excommunication, or other religious formulary, and from his hands it may pass into the *scrinium* of his monastery and be found there in after ages. Is this sufficient warrant for holding the Church or the Pope responsible as author? We might as well attribute to the Pope the letters of Ghengis-Khan, Timour the Tartar, or Bajazet, if any are yet extant in manuscript. Baluzius, Martene, and others, were only collectors, who published all the inedited matter they could find, genuine and spurious, good and worthless, chiefly on the ground that all these writings had come down from antiquity, and had not yet found an editor. They would be the last to imagine that by publishing such pieces they had given them any critical value.

The proper question to be asked is this: Was the "Tristram Shandy" form of excommunication ever found in any Ritual or Pontifical of the Roman or other churches? Was it ever used by any Pontiff, bishop or mitred abbot? And if so, when, where, and by whom? The answer to all this must be in the negative. It is said that Ernulphus, Bishop of Rochester, once used this form. If he did, we surely may question his good taste and sense of propriety. But it would be well to have proof of the fact. Even granting that he did, his solitary example proves nothing, or rather we may say in his case: *exceptio firmat regulam.* The thoughtless levity of one bishop proves nothing against the remaining bishops of the Catholic world, much less can it be accepted as proof of existing ecclesiastical jurisprudence. Why should the Popes or bishops adopt this new form? What was there to recommend it? Its only novelty is its petty nastiness; and even enemies must admit that our Pontiffs and prelates have habitually maintained gravity and decorum in

holding court and pronouncing sentence. The latter may have been occasionally severe, but it never was couched in the language of the streets.

We have said that the only novelty of the "Tristram Shandy" form consists in its few obnoxious words and phrases. This may be seen by comparing it with the forms of Marculphus, and with one singularly resembling it, but more fit to be pronounced from a Christian altar, viz., the excommunication of Rigoldus de Alsunza by Obertus, Bishop of Liege, in the days of Pope Eugene III., about the middle of the twelfth century. It may be found in Martene.[1] The groundwork of all these menaces and maledictions is derived, not from episcopal caprice or tyranny, but from the Bible. There is a great deal of empty talk and boast about Bible-reading which does not agree with facts. How many Bible-readers know or remember what they once read in the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy or in the hundred and eighth Psalm?[2] Yet these contain the germ of all sentences of excommunication used in mediæval times. The strong, vehement language of Old Testament Scripture, from which we now almost shrink, was exactly suited to the stiff necks and rough, coarse habits of thought prevalent in those ages.

The true form of excommunication must be sought, not in the codices of monkish *dilettanti* nor in the pages of romancers, but in the pages of the Ritual approved and used by the Church, above all in the Roman Pontifical,[3] which for centuries has been followed by all or nearly all the churches of the West. Nothing could be simpler or more direct than its formula. After an appeal to the example of the Apostles, it declares the sinner separate from the communion of the faithful, shut out from receiving the precious Body and Blood of our Lord, condemned and under anathema, until he returns to repentance and makes satisfaction for his offence. The only relic of mediæval times is an allusion to one of the principal causes that elicited the thunders of the Church in days gone by. "Whereas (it says), N. N., being duly warned, does not cease to lay waste the goods of the Church and *oppress the poor of Christ*," etc. This is the legal formula of the Roman Church, and none other is ever used, nor would it be lawful now for any bishop to select or invent formularies of his own. And yet in spite of all this, in defiance of truth, honor, justice and even common decency, the next time a priest is excommunicated in Europe or America, the old curse of fiction will

[1] Martene, Veterum Scriptorum. Amplissima Collectio. Parisiis, 1724, vol. ii., col. 78–80.

[2] Otherwise cix.

[3] Ordo excommunicandi et absolvendi. There is no book that can be more easily found by any honest inquirer after truth. Every Bishop, every church, and almost every priest has a copy.

be without doubt reproduced by bad Catholics and unscrupulous Protestants as the genuine form used on the occasion. Where are we to look for redress? We shall have none; for the maxim of Voltaire, "Lie boldly, lie always, something will stick," underlies the perpetual warfare that is carried on against the Catholic Church. But there is a higher Judge than the American public, a more august Tribunal, before which these wicked slanderers, Catholic and Protestant, shall stand one day and wish, but vainly wish, their words unspoken.

We will only add a word or two on the effects of excommunication. We might mention, in the first place, its most beneficial effect, and the one primarily intended. It brought about what other remedies had failed to do. It dragged the contumacious sinner repentant to his knees; it made him restore his ill-gotten goods, take back to his bosom and home the legitimate partner whom he had abandoned for the sake of a wanton, make good the wrong he had done to the poor by oppressing and trampling on their helplessness. Thus Count Rigold (of whom we have spoken before) confesses that it was the terrors of excommunication launched against him more than once, that made him fear for his soul's sake, repent, and restore property unjustly seized by his family and unjustly held for two or three generations.[1] But it was rather of the penal effects of excommunication that we wished to say a word. The prohibition of the Apostles to give no greeting to heretics or sinners under the ban was carried out in the primitive Church and lasted for centuries. Even in the days of Charlemagne the greeting of recognition and the kiss of friendship or domestic affection were alike withheld from the excommunicate (neque ave neque osculum). But when censures became so numerous, this became odious, and the law was modified by Gregory VII., who allowed all family and other necessary intercourse. When Europe became one great Christian commonwealth, then civil disabilites of various kinds became everywhere a sequel of excommunication. And this explains how naturally and logically the bond of allegiance that bound subjects to their prince was severed by excommunication of the latter. In such a great mass of excommunications may not some have been undeserved? Undoubtedly. Where, then, was the remedy? In submission, while offering explanations in self-defence, in patient waiting till a sense of justice should be awakened. And rare, indeed, was the case in which their patient waiting was not rewarded with final success. It happened that good men and even saints (not mock-saints and hypocrites, like the Jansenists, but true saints) were stricken by Church censures. Conscious of their in-

[1] "Maxime excommunicatione frequenti territus." Apud Martene, *loc. cit.*

nocence, they bent before the passing storm and trusted their case to Heaven's keeping. God invariably rewarded the confidence reposed in Him by His servants, and glorified them in the sight of all men. The penal effects of excommunication have now disappeared throughout the Catholic world, nothing remaining any longer to mark the condemned man but his exclusion from the sacraments. There remains, likewise, the invisible effect, which is much more important, though unseen of men. Sometimes God is pleased to show visibly his anger on the impenitent sinner, whom excommunication cannot move to repentance. All know what happened to Napoleon, who was rash and impious enough to deride the censures of the Church, to Espartero of Spain, excommunicated by Gregory XVI. for his sacrilegious invasion of the rights and property of the Church. And those who know something of our domestic history can tell of sad experiences that happened in Savannah, Charleston, Norfolk, and Philadelphia, some sixty or seventy years ago, when these churches were the prey of schism. Some of the unhappy men who fostered and fought for the schismatical state of things, were made visibly victims of God's wrath; others, equally wretched, were given over to hardness of heart and unbelief, and the lamp of faith in their households was quenched forever for themselves and their children. But God does not give us always visible tokens of his anger. He allows excommunication to work out its course silently and invisibly in the way allotted to it by His Providence. The soul, cursed by Christ's Vicar on earth, may laugh his words to derision, as did Napoleon once, and as does the heretical and infidel world around us. But when God's curse accompanies it, as it does in almost all cases, its effects are dreadful. It becomes a garment that the doomed man must wear in spite of himself, a girdle that binds him and of which he cannot get rid. It makes its way like water into his entrails, and like oil into his bones. (Ps. cvii. 18, 19.) It impairs and gradually destroys his spiritual faculties; it clouds his understanding, and enfeebles his will. It eats into his heart, and consumes gradually every element of spiritual life. It dries up all fountains of grace, and is the forerunner of everlasting reprobation. What were the privation of greeting and family intercourse in the Apostolic age, or the civil pains and penalties of mediæval times, compared with this dreadful result of excommunication which is hidden from men, but plain and visible to the eye of Faith?

THE INQUISITION MYTHOLOGY.

CAN anything of real interest still be found amid the general dulness of what ought long since to have become a worn-out controversy? This much—that even the Catholic of ordinary intelligence, who follows out the lines the controversy has hitherto taken, will learn to be neither faint-hearted nor of little faith whenever the Church is attacked.

Under the general name of the Inquisition the teaching and action of the Church are attacked, as shown in the history of certain tribunals—originally ecclesiastical—which are known by this name; and from the supposed workings of these tribunals judgment is passed on the Church's theory and practice of what is called religious toleration.

The controversy has, briefly, three periods.

I.

The first period answers to the hundred and more years immediately following the so-called Reformation. The Church was then savagely attacked as not teaching the doctrine of Christ at all. Accordingly she was at once Antichrist and Scarlet Woman and Babylon, whenever by spiritual or temporal means she attempted to keep control over the consciences of her children.

There was no plea for toleration included in this anathema hurled against her. So sturdy a Protestant as Hallam remarks that "persecution for religious heterodoxy, in all its degrees, was in the sixteenth century the principle as well as the practice of every church. It was held inconsistent with the sovereignty of the magistrate to permit any religion but his own; inconsistent with his duty to suffer any but the true."[1]

Calvin burned Servetus and defended his conduct, which was approved by the mild Melanchthon; and the state founded by him followed his example. Luther, it is true, against Rome would have "the burning of heretics to be contrary to the will of the Spirit." But he urged the princes to give the sword its right against the Anabaptists. And he incited Christians to bring pitch and brimstone to fire the synagogues of the Jews, and then to exterminate them, once for all, from the land.[2] He also warmly applauded the King of Denmark, who, without reason or pretext of law, had

[1] Literature of Europe, vol. ii. ch. 2.

[2] Döllinger, in Wetzer and Welte's "Kirchenlexicon," 1st edition.

deprived of their goods and thrown into prison all the Catholic bishops of what till then had been a Catholic realm. England meanwhile crowded the scaffold at Tyburn with martyrs whose sole crime was their fidelity to conscience and ancestral faith. Nor was this intolerant rancor limited to the poor "papists." In 1614 James I. burned two heretics and, says Hallam, "designed to have burned a third heretic, if the humanity of the multitude had not been greater than his own." The same historian thinks that the celebrated Fuller, in his "Church History," written about 1650, where he "speaks with some disapprobation of the sympathy of the people, ... was the latest Protestant who had tarnished his name by such sentiment."

The general principle of this period—that of the rise and first strength of Protestantism—was laid down by the Calvinist Bullinger in a preface to his "Decades," addressed to the boy-king, Edward the Sixth of England.[1] He endeavors to heighten the mildness which, we are so often assured, was characteristic of this prince, by urging him to put an end to what still remained of the old religion in his dominion. At this time, it is safe to say, three-fourths of the population had received all their knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, and still placed all their comfort for earth, their consolation in the hour of death, and their hopes of heaven, in what they and their forefathers had been taught by the Catholic Church. All this was to be put an end to forcibly by the meek boy-king in the name of the new "Gospel liberty." This was the respect which early Protestantism granted to the personal convictions of Catholics.

At the end of the first period the philosopher Hobbes—who is again in favor in our day because he cannot be suspected of religious faith of any kind, and is thus a fair representative of civil atheism—declares that "true religion consists in obedience to Christ's lieutenants (temporal sovereigns), and in giving God such honor, both in attributes and actions, as they in their several lieutenancies shall ordain."[2]

During all this period, the cruelties said to be exercised by the Spanish Inquisition were retailed everywhere to the English people high and low. But they were not yet cited as samples of intolerance, but simply as Anti-Christian martyrdom of the saints. An example of this is the book entitled "Clamor Sanguinis Martyrum" (The Cry of the Blood of Martyrs), published in London in 1656.

This first period deeply rooted in the minds of the English

---

[1] Ed. Parker Society.

[2] Ed. Molesworth.

people the dark and sinister mythology connected with the name of the Inquisition.

II.

The second period dates from the well-known work of Limborch, the Arminian theologian. His "History of the Inquisition" was published at Amsterdam in 1692, and contained a copy of the judicial sentences of the Inquisition of Toulouse from the year 1307 to the year 1323. The Arminians were Remonstrants against the dominant Calvinists, as these in their first days had been Protestants against Catholics. Like the Independents in England, their position of galling inferiority in the state seems to have opened their minds to certain logical consequences of the Protestant theory, which they were perhaps the first to formulate. If the private judgment of each member of the community is to be for him the only authority decisive of religious truth, then, clearly, all social religion, beyond mere coincidence of opinion and good-fellowship, is out of the question. Not only is the Church invisible, but pastors may not bind consciences—not even by declaration of Bible law or doctrine; for the individual conscience may judge otherwise in its own high court of appeal. Thus the community has no right, in so far as it is religious, to interfere in any way with the profession and propagation of religious beliefs. This broad result, however, was as yet limited to beliefs which were the outcome of private judgment on the text of Scripture, the existence and divine authority of which was not yet questioned.

Constant internal dissensions and fresh divisions were ever urging onward, as to the only solution of ever increasing difficulties, to mutual toleration among the discordant children of the "Reformation." This the dominant sects in the various countries gradually and grudgingly enough conceded. Private opinion alone was not yet set up as the soul's standard of authority, but the Bible interpreted by private judgment. Still, in practice the atheist was admitted to rights that were long denied to the benighted Catholic.

> Turk, Jew or Atheist
> May enter here, but not a Papist.

The human reason now needed to justify to itself this refusal to extend toleration to Catholics. In consequence the attack on the Church was embittered by the introduction of a new and much needed element. Heretofore she had been persecuted because she was idolatrous. But the reaction against early Puritanism had brought a large number of the High Church followers of Laud into fuller sympathy with the doctrines of Rome than with those

of Geneva. If toleration of Catholics were added to this, the practical result might be disastrous, especially among a people who had such remnants of "popery" as the English. Hence it was found that the Roman Catholic Church, by her past intolerance, had put herself outside the pale of human sympathy and of justice itself.

True, she had only defended that right to existence as a society which she had enjoyed for centuries, and, so far as her official action went, she had been consistent with principles towards which the Protestant world was now relenting. On the other hand, the Protestant sects, to found upstart societies without a past and often opposed to the will of the people on whom they were forced, had been persecuting in the teeth of their own principles. In such a state of affairs, not the reason, but the imagination and passions of men were to be aroused against Rome.

First, the Church was to be considered the embodiment of a tyrannical principle rendering her dangerous to the liberty and peace of all nations.

Next, the errors and vices and crimes of her children and of the entire ages in which she had lived and ruled were to be thrown upon her, and declared the necessary outcome of this fundamental principle.

Finally, all this was to be thoroughly seasoned with the already existing tales of horror, and as many new ones as the fertile genius of the times could bring forth. There would be a strong antecedent probability in favor of them all.

Accordingly, this was the epoch of revolting and obscene histories, memoirs, relations, etc., of the Inquisition, with its horrors in Spain, in Portugal, in the Indies, in all dark "popish" lands. And the insular, patriotic, un-foreigner-loving English nation hugged itself with delight to hear from Bunyan that, "as for the Giant Pope, though he be yet alive, he is, by reason of age, and also of the many shrewd brushes that he met with in his younger days, grown so crazy and stiff in his joints that he can now do little more than sit in his cave's mouth, grinning at pilgrims as they go by, and biting his nails because he cannot come at them. So I saw that Christian went on his way; yet at the sight of the old man that sat at the mouth of the cave, he could not tell what to think, especially because he spoke to him, though he could not go after him, saying, You will never mend till more of you be burned."

Thus the traditional Protestant conscience became deeply stained for another hundred years, down far into our own century.

In the year 1810, a certain John Joseph Stockdale was responsible for the publication in London of "The History of the Inquisitions; including the Secret Transactions of those Horrific

Tribunals." Its occasion was "the important question, whether the claims of the Roman Catholics to equal political rights with Protestants should or should not be conceded by the Protestant Government of the Protestant United kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." That Ireland should be reckoned part of a Protestant United kingdom is bad enough. But what, remembering the nature and extent of the penal laws against Catholics, is to be thought of the following summary exhortation?

"The page of history, ancient and modern, even of these our days, now open for our inspection and our improvement, clearly proves that the Roman Catholic religion was, is, and will continue, in principle and in practice, unchanged and unchangeable. [This, of course, is also the Catholic's position; but observe our tolerant historian's conclusion from it.] Oh, Protestants, observe then, as you have done hitherto towards your Catholic brethren, perfect tolerance, perfect charity—but, always bear in mind the fable of the wolves and the sheep. *Remember, never to give up your vigilance. Remember the massacre of St. Bartholomew;* and remember that Popery, having been driven out of Rome, has taken refuge amongst us and is, with unceasing activity, daily gaining proselytes to its cause, especially among our highest and lowest classes. Read the following pages with more than serious—with solemn attention, for Popery is making rapid advances against your religion, and the embryo of the Inquisition (may I never find it necessary to be more explicit on this subject) is actually established in every part of the United kingdom."

III.

The second or legendary period of the history of the Inquisition has slowly passed into the third and latest in our own time. The unavoidable political necessity has everywhere arisen of including Catholics in the general scheme of toleration. The religion of the "Reformed" nations, resting on no solid basis, has long been made a plaything for the conceit and party spirit of men, and has become tasteless to a generation weary of its assumptions, of its illogical confusions, and of its violence. With the consequent indifference to all religious truth, has come the desire to relegate religion itself to a mental region wherein emotional natures may find a congenial food in harmless sentiment and opinions.

At the beginning of the century, the German philosopher Fichte declared that the man of letters was the true high priest of this age. Later, what is called science has tried to usurp the place of religion. And the state-god has still more lately come to the front in a way that would have delighted the heart of Hobbes. Unluckily, the two essential elements of the religious problem

remain the same: the subjective needs of men living for a short time and never remaining in the same state, and the objective satisfaction they find in the existing system of revelation in the Catholic Church, which is as lasting as the human needs she is designed to remedy. The Church has therefore held her own in spite of the spirit of the age. It is not wonderful, then, that in the renewed attacks upon the Church, since her life and vigorous action are so obnoxious, recourse should again be had to the Inquisition of the past.

Men of letters have accordingly sought weapons in the manipulation of documents, or have furbished up their old arms to glare as terribly as may be under the light of modern historical research. These weapons the so-called men of science have eagerly seized, joining with the secularists or worshipers of the state-god in forming an aggressive and propagandist sect against the Church. Perhaps they deem it necessary, by appealing to the past, to draw away attention from the present, where they are ever more and more gaining the exclusive support and protection of the civil government. But in that past which they so vituperate, the people's faith and the countenance of sovereign power were, for the most part at least, in harmony. Who will dare to say the same of their own system?

Mr. Andrew Dickson White is, or was, the President of Cornell University—a secularist institution of the higher learning on which the great American commonwealth, the State of New York, has bestowed its enormous official patronage. In a lecture on the "Warfare of Science," which he has declaimed through the country, he leads off with "a remark made by one of the most moderate and judicially fair of modern philosophic historians (this from Mr. White probably means the late Prof. Draper—perhaps Buckle), that of all organizations this world has known, the Roman Church has caused most undeserved woe and shed most innocent blood."

This is worthy of the late Mr. Stockdale himself. In fact, the Catholic reader may easily persuade himself from the writings of the modern infidel school that, even where belief in Christ has long since been lost, the phantom of the Pope as Antichrist has not yet vanished.

In face of this sweeping assertion of "one of the most moderate and judicially fair of modern philosophic historians," a few words, from pages immediately following, will aptly illustrate the religious animus and habit of thought of the tolerant state-functionary who cites it. Speaking of Galileo, Mr. White says that the archbishop of Pisa was probably "the vilest enemy of the human race"; and that his "cathedral is more truly consecrated by the remembrance of Galileo's observation of the lamp swinging before its altar

than by all the church services of a thousand years." All which sounds to a Catholic ear as much like coarse and reviling blasphemy as would its exact counterpart: "Calvary would have been more truly consecrated by the remembrance of an astronomer's observation of the eclipse of the sun at the moment of our Lord's death than by all the sufferings of the Son of God for the sins of men."

To escape this, it is not enough to leap alertly back from science to the old Protestant ground and declare the Mass no true sacrifice, but only a "blessed muttering" and idolatrous superstition. This may do for purely religious controversy. But the writer of history is supposed to take into account the faith which was the prime fact of the age in question. He may blaspheme what he knows not; but why should he judge what he ignores?

These later times, indeed, have shown that there is no depth of ignorance to which the average man of science may not sink whenever there is question of theology or philosophy, or of history. And it is not out of the way, since the Inquisition is an example ready to hand, to insist on how far professed men of science appeal to the mass of Protestant traditions and prejudices, when the Church chances to cross their path. Once more, they no longer believe even in a Protestant Christ; but they hate the Catholic Pope and dearly love meat on Friday.

The "International Scientific Series," originated by the late editor of the "American Popular Science Monthly," has had among its contributors such representative men as Prof. Tyndall, Mr. Herbert Spencer, Dr. Maudsley, Prof. Bain, Mr. Romanes, the notorious Paul Bert, besides others scarcely less pronounced on the hostile relations pretended to exist between science and religion. To this question the whole twelfth volume of the series was devoted—a history of the "Conflict between Religion and Science," by John William Draper. Since the death of the author an attempt has been made by his school of science to forget this work.[1] This is in the right direction and might prove successful, were it not that certain tactics of their own are, to use the felicitous phrase of President White, "truly consecrated by the remembrance." From cover to cover there is perhaps not a single sign of any effort made to find out, we do not say the truth, but the elementary conditions of any one among the hundreds of questions raised. It is not pretended that the author was possessed of a miraculous intuition of things. It also seems prudent to believe that his only acquired training fitted him for far other lines of thought. In any case no evidence is ever placed by the author before his reader, enabling the latter to review the judgments set down for his acceptance.

[1] See remark in Necrology of English scientific journal, *Nature*, at the time.

Professor Draper was no friend of the Protestant system. He said pertinently enough: "So far as science is concerned, nothing is owed to the Reformation. The Procrustean bed of the Pentateuch was still before her."[1] Nevertheless, no man, perhaps, has shown such skill and industry in diverting the great stream of the Protestant tradition against Rome into infidel channels.

Especially complete is his presentment of the case against the Inquisition. After a great deal of previous violent and rather absurd historical incrimination, he says: "As the thirteenth century is approached, we find unbelief in all directions setting in. . . . . To withstand this flood of impiety, the papal government established two institutions: 1. The Inquisition: 2. Auricular confession—the latter as a means of detection, the former as a tribunal for punishment."

This, spoken in the name of science, really is enough to take our breath away. We defy any one to find its match in grotesque absurdity among all the tales recounted of foreigners by the Chinese literary men to their lowest countrymen. But the Professor continues, and neither his mythology nor his unconsciousness of absurdity grows less:

"In general terms the commission of the Inquisition was to extirpate religious dissent by terrorism, and surround heresy with the most horrible associations; this necessarily implied the power of determining what constitutes heresy. The criterion of truth was thus in possession of this tribunal [!] . . . With such savage alacrity did it carry out its object of protecting the interests of religion that between 1481 and 1808 it had punished three hundred and forty thousand persons, and of these nearly thirty-two thousand had been burnt [!!]."[2] Here follow in the space of a page—"the air was full of fearful shadows"—"unscrupulous atrocities"—"a frightful statement of its conduct and appalling cruelties"—"this disgrace of Christianity and indeed of the human race." All this is bravely said, but what follows caps the climax. "The necessity of private confession to a priest—auricular confession—gave omnipresence and omniscience to the Inquisition [!!!]. Not a man was safe. . . . His wife and his servants were turned into spies. . . . . No accuser was named; but the thumb-screw, the stretching-rope, the boot and wedge, or other enginery of torture, soon supplied that defect, and, innocent or guilty, he accused himself."

The Professor has no misgivings. Not so Mr. Stockdale, who three-quarters of a century ago published the like sounding tales, if, indeed, he is not the chief authority of our man of science. He thus expresses a feeling which for some time doubtless has been

---

[1] Page 215.

[2] Page 207.

stealing over the reader and which seems seriously to have troubled the apprehension of that doughty antagonist of the Church of Rome.

"It may be objected to me, that society could not exist under the control of an authority so tyrannical, nor could so many centuries have elapsed of blind submission to the power of a tribunal which trenched, in so flagrant a manner, upon the rights and interests of mankind." Hereupon the sapient Mr. Stockdale appeals to "the bloody and atrocious rites of Canaan, Tyre and Carthage," and then wisely remarks that "the frame of society is of a more stubborn texture than most people imagine."[1] Clearly, among the few of imagination strong enough to take in the stubborn texture of society's frame, must henceforth be numbered Professor Draper and President White. The reader will probably prefer, as an honest man, to be set down in the commoner category of "most people."

What we have cited is a sufficient specimen of the entire case as made out again and again by a recent man of science against the Church. Perhaps the author relied on the pages intervening between his different charges to prevent the cursory reader from discovering that they are so like because they are all ground from the same mill. No mention is ever made of the serious and successful attacks on the veracity of his chief authority, Llorente, who is followed unhesitatingly, and styled simply "the historian of the Inquisition." To a sober and fair mind, familiar with the authentic extremes of despotism and anarchy, the whole story is at first sight so unparalleled in the history of man as to be in the highest degree improbable, if not impossible. The evident and violent partisanship of the narrators in every period of the controversy does not tend to reassure him. In fact, he fully concurs with the closing sentiment of the scientific professor, though from far different motives. "With unutterable disgust and indignation, we learn [that is, are taught in this mockery of learning] that the papal government realized much money by selling to the rich dispensations to secure them from the Inquisition."

IV.

We have now briefly reviewed the three great periods of this strange but popular controversy. We have seen that, while positive beliefs are changing around it, this odious mythology ever holds its ground. The reason is not far to seek. It offers all the enemies of the Church, whether Protestant or infidel, a popular weapon, the force of which will easily be felt among minds who

[1] History, etc., Preface, xi., xii.

could never grasp a theory. With recent infidels, as in the case of Professor Huxley in other questions of religious controversy, the Christianity of Protestantism may be rejected, but never its protest against Rome.

From all this it might be hoped that those non-Catholic students who live beyond the heat of disputation should, on many points of the controversy, side with the Church and with the Inquisitors themselves. This, in fact, is the case. There are obvious reasons why their testimony can never be complete or satisfactory. But such as it is, it points clearly to the fact, on which we have insisted all along, that this odious mythology, to call it by its right name once again, is kept before the public, not for purposes of truth, but as a weapon of partisan hatred against the Church.

Writers of this dispassionate school very commonly acknowledge that the abuses of the Inquisition have been exaggerated for party purposes, were independent of the lawful use of this tribunal, and owing to individual ignorance, imprudence, illusion and false zeal, or even vice.[1]

Thus Ranke, though stating facts incorrectly and misunderstanding their import, depreciates the authority of Llorente and seems to think that the Inquisition in Spain was "only a royal tribunal, furnished with spiritual weapons." This is not a quite exact statement of the case, but it indicates the trend of thought, with which alone we are occupied. In this Leo and Guizot in the main agree. Such authors, and even the ultra-Protestant Neander, naturally attribute much to the necessities of an age formed by centuries of rude warfare and in which the breaking up of religious unity was a subversion of the existing social order.

It is a curious fact that, in the agitation preceding the Vatican Council, the small historical clique which afterwards fell away altogether from the Catholic faith gave forth many doubtful utterances on our controversy. Janus and Huber connected the Inquisition with the doctrine of Papal Infallibility in order to bring odium on the latter. Schulte declared it "a product of the Papal doctrine of faith and morals," which it certainly was not. This insufficiency of the impartial non-Catholic school, and the spitefulness of certain half-Catholic writers trimming between the Church and the world, show what the Catholic student has to expect. He might as well wait for those who reject the authority of the Church to defend the infallibility of the Church's head, as to look for a really final vindication from them of the Church's action when it is used, as in the present case, in virtue of her authority.

---

[1] See, in the excellent essays of a Catholic author too much neglected by his own brethren, Muzzarelli, *Il buon uso della Logica in materia di religione*, t. iv.

It is well, however, to put down a few special reasons why the non-Catholic student of the history of the Inquisition is not likely to reach far below the surface. These are not so much owing to the nature of the question as to the student himself; and in their wide application to other religious controversies, they amount to a general answer to the objections made all along the line against the Church. Armed with this answer, even the Catholic who is uninstructed in the controversy can give a true and trustworthy reply whenever attacked. It is that of the Apostle already cited: "*You blaspheme what you know not.*"

In the first place, the student in question is not at all likely to possess the necessary training in theological terms and canon law to understand the very documentary evidence in his hands. Cardinal Newman's remonstrance, in a somewhat similar case, has its application here, and, as we have said, all along the line of religious controversy.[1]

"Men fancy that, though they have never seen Clement or Ignatius, or any other Father before, they are quite as well qualified to interpret the words λειτουργία or προσφορά, as if they knew them and their brethren well. How different is their judgment in other matters! Who will not grant, except in the case of theology, that an experienced eye is an important qualification for understanding the distinction of things or detecting their course and tendency? In politics, the sagacious statesman puts his finger on some apparently small or not confessedly great event, promptly declares it to be 'no little matter,' and is believed. Why? Because he is conceived to have scholarship in the language of political history, and to be well read in the world's events. In the same way, the comparative anatomist falls in with a little bone, and confidently declares from it the make, habits, and age of the animal to which it belonged. What should we say to the unscientific hearer who disputed his accuracy and attempted to argue against him? Yet, is not this just the case of sciolists, or less than sciolists in theology?"

Akin to this first defect of knowledge is the strange ignorance, almost sure to be found, of the piety and higher influence of religion in the age whose history is in question. How many historians of the Spanish Inquisition even dreamed of those deep and lasting developments of the spiritual life of the whole people, appearing at that very time round such saints as the Carmelites Teresa and John of the Cross, the Franciscan Peter of Alcantara, the Dominican Lewis Bertrand, the Jesuits Ignatius Loyola, Francis Borgia, and the crowd of missionaries who, in the footsteps of St. Francis Xavier, sealed the faith with their sweat and blood

[1] Essay on Development, c. vii., 5.

among all the races of the earth? Yet here was the human family, from kings to people, far more vitally affected than by the Inquisition itself; and with an action still modifying the whole course of civilization. It is not to be wondered at that, with such ignorance, a whole age, and much more the workings of a single ecclesiastical tribunal, should be totally misjudged.

It may be added that so rare is an entire absence of prejudice that the facts themselves, known only in part as they are, will regularly take on a color not their own, but due to the jaundiced eye of the observer. Thus it has been well said of the historian Prescott: "In opposition to all history, he still asserts that St. Dominic was the founder of the Inquisition, or at least maintains that if he was not, in point of fact, he *ought* to have been." Again, "Mr. Prescott detects many gross historical inaccuracies in Llorente unconnected with the Inquisition, in painting which, accord- to him, he was never at fault!"[1] Besides all this, the essential elements of the ecclesiastical problem will regularly be missed, as was the case with Ranke.

Another of the immediate and most general results reached by the Catholic student, who has carefully gone over this ground, is a well-founded distrust of much pretentious historical research.

One of the very latest writers on the early Inquisition in the south of France, in a documentary work of more than five hundred pages, starts off abruptly from the Council of Toulouse in the year 1229.[2] This was the time when a permanent tribunal was first established, but it was also the time when the work was already leaving the Church's hands. During the seventy preceding years measures had been devised in fifty-two councils, of which two were general, for stemming the evils of the times. The official proceedings of these councils, with the contemporary writings of preachers, pontifical legates, theologians, bishops, Popes, and chroniclers, as well as of the revolutionary heretics themselves, are perfectly accessible to the conscientious historian. But this new trumpeter in the name of modern science against the fair fame of the Church has not even taken the trouble of making himself acquainted with these documents. This is undoubtedly more convenient, but it can scarcely be called reasonable. It is certainly characteristic of a strange kind of science.

Catholic history, therefore, in a question so closely bound up with religion, can, at best, hope to gain from non-Catholic students some corroborative testimony to the truth, with an occasional rectification of facts and frequent clever political views. But with those engaged in direct religious controversy things will be evidently at the worst. Inquisition, early or late, Episcopal or Do-

[1] Abp. Spalding's Miscellanies, xi.

[2] Molinier.

minican, Roman or Spanish, papal or royal, will be to them the same as one. And they will deridingly point to their heap of undigested facts, partially stated, exaggerated, added to, taken from, ridiculously misinterpreted, confused, falsified, and ask, Where is the Holy Ghost?

President White may appear in this rôle, so unworthy of his position. Enlarging on the "idea" "that the Pope, as *pope*, had never condemned the doctrines of Kopernik and Galileo, . . . that they were condemned by the cardinals of the Inquisition and Index" (which was the simple fact), he declares: "Nothing can show the desperation of the retreating party better than jugglery like this."[1]

Yet treatises on the condemnation of theological propositions, written before Galileo's own day, might have told Mr. White when the power of the Church in defining matters of faith is used, and when it is not. How, too, can he charge "Monsignor" Marini with "the pious fraud of suppressing documents or interpolating pretended facts,"[2] when he himself, if his words have any meaning, declares loudly that the decision in the case was "made by the Pope and the Church," and yet omits to say, what surely he was bound to know before writing on such a subject, that not one of the conditions necessary for a definition of Catholic faith was present? Moreover, he pronounces, *ex cathedra:* "The Inquisition itself, backed by the greatest theologian of the time, Bellarmine, took the same view." Yet Bellarmine himself, years before the famous trial, in the second chapter of his fourth book on the Roman Pontiff, had given the answer to so gratuitous an assertion, which, besides, his published correspondence on the occasion directly refutes.

After this, no surprise need be felt at the absence of all mention of the most essential facts in the case—such as the strain on the minds and hearts of men in authority during those troublous times, when revolutionary heresy was ever impending from the North, or Galileo's own intimacy with the treacherous Fra Paolo Sarpi, or the inopportuneness, lack of judgment, and insufficiency of his arguments. Perhaps, however, this may be the result of President White's earnest desire not to imitate Monsignor Marini, and thus, by telling the truth, "to blacken the memory of Galileo and save the reputation of the Church."[3] It seems, also, to have been more convenient to leave out of sight the fact that Galileo retained his faith, even after the condemnation of his astronomy, and does not seem to have dreamed of the consequences against the Church's teaching which his admirer so indiscreetly undertakes to draw.

[1] Page 60.

[2] Page 52, note, and elsewhere.

[3] Page 53.

But it is time that we should finish with these hateful specimens of a mythology, carried on with unheard-of violence and disregard of all truth and honesty, out of pure partisan hatred of the Church. It is again President White who, in his own words, shall give a final specimen of the ignorance and prejudice and dull blundering confusion of ideas, mixing what is acknowledged to be human with what is claimed to be divine, which characterizes the whole controversy. The extravagant vulgarity of the language is also characteristic in its way. "It is most suggestive," to Mr. White, "to see in this crisis of the Church, on the eve of the greatest errors in Church policy the world has known, in all the efforts and deliberations of these consecrated leaders of the Church, at the tomb of the prince of the Apostles, no more sign of the guidance or presence of the Holy Spirit than in a caucus of New York politicians."[1] There is nothing new in all this. For thousands of years similar farragos have been foisted on Catholics, regardless of all their protests, by those who reproach the Church, "*while they say to her, day by day: Where is thy God?*"[2]

We have thus attempted a general review of the different aspects, from the worst to the best, of the historical controversy concerning the Inquisition. This, from the "Reformation" down, has been one of the most popular weapons of attack against the Church, and assuredly the horrors of its mythology are well adapted to imprint themselves on the popular imagination and resist all refutation of reason. It is a comfort to find that frank and candid study leads to truth, even along this unpromising path. By this way came to the very door of the Catholic Church Hurter, in his study of the history of Innocent the Third—the great Pope on whom, whether for odium or for love, rests the responsibility of the early Inquisition.

---

[1] Page 44.

[2] Psalm xli. 11.

NO ACTUAL NEED OF A CATHOLIC PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES.

WHEN an election for President of the United States approaches there has been latterly much said in the papers of the Catholic vote, and of the tactics used by this or that party to win it. The question naturally arises, whether there is any such thing as a Catholic vote in this country, and whether Catholics, as such, form a class apart, who have no political views, who never belong to any of the great parties, but at election time act on the spur of the moment, and vote as one man by some curious and inscrutable impulse. This is certainly not the case. The Catholics as a body have no special political views of their own, and do not form or constitute a party, or even an organization like the Order of United Americans, constituting the nucleus and working machinery of a party. Each Catholic adopts his own views on political questions freely, without bias, supports any party he prefers, gives his adhesion to any candidate, advocates whatever policy seems best to him as to tariff, protection, government lands, the management of the Indian tribes, pauper immigration, railroad grants, harbor defence, our foreign relations, or any other matter. On all questions before the American public, the Catholic is free to act; but where faith is or morals are concerned, a Catholic is not free to give his support to any policy aiming at the destruction of Christianity or good morals, and every conscientious Protestant will admit that he is similarly bound. The position is not peculiar to Catholicity. No man, Catholic or Protestant, is free to act against Christianity or morality, to support any system tending to the overthrow of natural rights or all civil government.

As Congress is prohibited by one of the Constitutional amendments from establishing a State religion, or requiring a religious test, there is scarcely any scope for the possibility of such action by the Federal Government as would make Catholics a proscribed class. If the amendment passed as one of the results of the late civil war, by which the several States were restrained from depriving any citizen of rights generally enjoyed, by reason of his race, color, or former condition of servitude, had included also the word "religion," the immunity would have extended to the position of each citizen in regard to the State in which he lived, as well as in regard to the United States. A State denying the elective franchise to citizens of foreign race would lose in that proportion its

right to representatives in Congress, unless it had but one, and under the original compact could not lose that one. Hence, Rhode Island or Delaware can apparently disfranchise naturalized citizens, though as to this there may be some doubt.

But any State can make the profession of the Protestant religion, by every resident within its bounds, necessary to the holding of land, exercising of a profession, voting, or being chosen to office; and the Federal Government cannot interfere. The Constitution as originally adopted a century ago, and all the amendments, leave the power in the hands of each State to establish a religion, or make profession of the Protestant religion a requisite for any purpose whatever, and to exact a test oath.

At the time of the Revolution the Constitutions adopted in several of the States excluded Catholics from office or from the franchise. In the address of the Roman Catholics to George Washington, after his elevation to the Presidential chair, pointed allusion was made to this unjust discrimination against Catholics, notably in New Jersey and in North and South Carolina. Mild as Archbishop Carroll was, he fairly blazed with honest American indignation at the conduct of New Jersey on this point: "The Jersey State," he wrote, "was the first which, on forming her new Constitution, gave the unjust example of reserving to Protestants alone the prerogatives of government and legislation. At that very time the American army swarmed with Roman Catholic soldiers, and the world would have held them justified had they withdrawn themselves from the defence of a State which treated them with so much cruelty and injustice, and which they then actually covered from the depredations of the British army. But their patriotism was too disinterested to hearken to the first impulse of even just resentment."

The limitation of civil rights to Protestants alone was not peculiar to the States named. Massachusetts established Congregationalism by her Constitution as the State church, and the Supreme Court, in a case where a Catholic had built and maintained a church, and consequently claimed that he was exempt from obligation to support a minister of any other church, decided that he must pay to support the Protestant minister, declaring distinctly that wherever, in the Constitution or laws, the word "minister" occurred, the word "Protestant" was to be understood. Rev. Mr. Cheverus was indicted and tried for marrying a Catholic couple in Maine, on the ground that he was not the settled minister of the place. New Hampshire, down to our time, has excluded Catholics from office. New York, in her Constitution, had clauses craftily devised by the bigoted John Jay to exclude Catholics from office, and no Catholic could be naturalized in that State before the adoption of the Federal Constitution; and even after that the oath of

office required of all members of the Legislature a profession of the Protestant religion, so that no Catholic could sit in that body.

Of the remaining States the number was comparatively small where the declaration of rights was so distinct and clear as to leave the civil rights of Catholics unimpeachable.

Practically, however, as time went on, religious freedom and equality gained, till New Hampshire stood alone in her shameful preëminence.

And what has been, may be. It is not probable, but yet it is possible, that several of the large States might disfranchise Catholics, suppress their religious institutions, and exile their clergy. Such things have been done in the nineteenth century, even in America; and were done systematically in Germany.

Such a case would alone give rise to a Catholic party. The Catholics, deprived of their rights, or finding the great political parties banded together to deprive them of rights, or to deny them redress where rights, though sanctioned by the Constitution and laws, were systematically trampled upon, would have no alternative but to organize and by peaceful agitation endeavor to obtain a revocation of unjust laws, or such distinct and clear legislation as would practically insure their rights in the time to come. Only under such a state of affairs can a Catholic party be possible; and it always presupposes a dominant anti-Catholic party denying us equal rights.

Only once, we believe, and then in a local matter, it has been necessary for Catholics to act as a body politically, and that was in New York city. The old school system of New York was preeminently religious. The idea of educating the young without religious influence pervading the system had never been heard of, and would have been rejected at once. That monstrous scheme was forced on the American people only by crafty and shrewdly planned gradual steps. The general sentiment was in favor of religious education. The churches, with few exceptions, maintained schools, and the State or City granted aid to each in proportion to the number of pupils. In time an association of gentlemen called "The Public School Society" was formed, as its charter declared, to take charge of children whose parents belonged to no church. This Society and its schools prospered, and when it was discovered that a Protestant church had, by false representations as to the number of pupils in its schools, obtained for some years a larger share of the public money than it was entitled to, a feeling arose against giving aid to church schools, and it was finally withheld from all. The Public School Society, though a private body, received all the aid; but its books teemed with misrepresentations of Catholic doctrine, with perversions of history

calculated to hold Catholics up to ridicule and contempt as ignorant, tyrannical, cruel and immoral. The teaching from the lips of the preceptors only deepened the effect of the vile mendacity of the text books. Catholics asked that the old New York system should be revived under proper safeguards, and the aid formerly given to church schools be again bestowed. This was refused by the city authorities, and Catholics resolved to apply to the State Legislature. It is false that they asked anything new, or anything especially for themselves. They asked simply that a system which had prevailed for years, should be continued. When candidates were nominated for the Assembly by the Whig and Democratic parties, these gentlemen all pledged themselves to oppose the Catholic petition. Catholics, whether Whig or Democrat, could not vote for men who, before a question had been discussed and examined in the legislative hall, pledged themselves to one side. Every one would have been unfit for the jury box in a civil or criminal trial, and was unfit for the legislature. As Catholics could not vote for the candidates before the public, they adopted a ticket of their own, and cast a very considerable vote, to the astonishment of the hack politicians of those days. The result was the adoption of a system of State schools, superseding the Public School Society. This was the present New York system, and when organized it purchased of the Public School Society, an anti-Catholic body, its schools, but no church schools. The new system was full of promise of equal rights and full justice to all without distinction of religion, but it is only one of those

> "Dead Sea fruits that tempt the eye
> And turn to ashes on the lips."

The system is and has been essentially Protestant in its managers, in its trustees, school-boards, text-books and spirit.

Germany within the last twenty years has shown, on a more vast and enduring scale, the result of the operation of similar causes. Catholicity in Germany and Austria, leavened by the half infidelity of Joseph II. and the spirit of revolt exhibited at Ems, seemed to lack robustness and energy; but when the new made Emperor sought to rival Decius and Diocletian by warring on the Church, expelling the religious orders, exiling bishops and priests, the Catholic body was organized, able leaders arose, and the Catholic party in Germany has since been a united and powerful element, called into existence not by any spontaneous action on their own part, but by the necessity resulting from an inhuman and hypocritical persecution. Its power has been such that the great Chancellor of Germany has been forced to conciliate it; but the Catholic party will hold together till every semblance of oppression ceases.

Even if in time it dissolves, as it may possibly do, the elements of organization remain, and at the first note of danger the host will start up ready for action.

We cannot foresee any combination of circumstances in this country that can ever force the Catholics here, like their fellow-believers in Germany, to organize as a political party; but the Societies grouping in Unions already furnish much of the machinery, if the need ever comes.

There is, then, no Catholic party in this country, and fortunately no reason or motive for calling one into existence. Nor is it easy to foresee the possibility of events likely to justify such a step. Of themselves Catholics will never organize as a party; it will only be when they are forced to do so in self-defence, to protect their dearest rights when menaced; the responsibility will be not at their door, but at that of their enemies.

In the Spanish American republics the government has fallen into the hands of infidels, and is controlled by the secret societies. There the Catholic religion is oppressed; every other form of religion, Christian or heathen, is free and encouraged; but Catholics who are attached to their faith have no rights. They are stigmatized as clericals even in our newspaper press, which is regularly subsidized by these infidel governments, and constantly perverts the truth in the news it gives. The Church has been plundered of its property, bishops are driven out at the whim of any president or dictator; religious orders, with their institutions of education and charity, have been suppressed; the outward manifestation of religion, even the wearing of the cassock, processions, and the like, are prohibited. A Mexican may join a Masonic lodge and bind himself by engagements, but he cannot enter a religious order founded by a canonized saint. He cannot obtain a school such as he and his Catholic neighbors desire, for the government will suppress it. And our hireling American press chinks its ill-gotten money and writes about "Clericals" being bitter enemies of the government of their country!

A Catholic party is there put down by military power. Prison, confiscation, exile await the Catholic bishop, priest or editor who attempts to lay before the people the claim of right which citizens who adhere to the religion of their ancestors justly have.

Even now the Archbishop of Guatemala is an exile at San Francisco, expelled by a man who has set the constitution aside and made himself dictator with absolute power.

But the infidel spirit of the French Revolution, which sowed its seed in Spanish America, is now at its ripened harvest. Fortunately the religious and political training of our colonial days saved our republic from being such a mockery.

We do not live in Germany or in Spanish America, and have no such evils to contend against as our fellow Catholics have in those lands.

There are local grievances in some States; there are injustices to be remedied under the Federal Government in regard to the Indians, and soldiers, marines and sailors in the employ of Government whose religious rights are not respected; but the evils have grown up through apathy on the part of Catholics and hypocritical activity on the part of cliques of fanatics who have obtained a kind of control in some departments; but in all these cases redress can be obtained by effort.

The exclusion of New Mexico from admission as a State, and the federal disfranchisement of its people for nearly half a century, is based undoubtedly, in part at least, on anti-Catholic feeling; but the wrong has been submitted to without remonstrance.

At this moment there is no national or general question appealing to Catholics as such. In the coming Presidential election there will be nothing in the platform of either the Democratic or Republican party which will, so far as we can judge, call on any Catholic to oppose it as hostile to the faith, the Church, or sound morals. Neither of these parties can claim the vote of Catholics on the ground that the other menaces their rights.

The Labor parties, of which there are several, discordant in their plans and remedies, all appeal to classes which number thousands of Catholics. Some of these Labor parties have elements at war with Christianity, with social order, and rights to life and property.

That these Labor parties will gain votes among Catholics is certain; but those who espouse their cause will not vote as Catholics, but as workingmen seeking a relief that seems to them just. A few, perhaps, will openly embrace doctrines which they know the Church rejects, and vote in defiance of its teaching; but in so doing they cease to be Catholics.

Among the avowed socialists, communists and nihilists there are, of course, none who can be called Catholics. Other labor organizations which have no element condemned by the Church expressly or in general terms, will naturally find Catholic supporters.

The cause of temperance has many warm advocates in the Church, from the great Bishop of Saint Paul to the humblest priest and layman who seeks to diminish the fearful crime of intemperance; but the Prohibition party, as such, will have few Catholic adherents. Our people, as a rule, see in the leaders and organizers of that party a set of fanatics who, when not assailing intemperance, are warring against Catholicity, and accordingly have an instinctive dread of them and their political panaceas. Any one who will devote a few hours to a study of the temperance literature of

the day will find that their writings are leavened through and through with an intense and bitter hatred of the Catholic Church, and that they fail utterly to recognize the work done by members of our Church, individually or in societies, for rescuing immortal souls, not by human respect, but by supernatural motives.

As the political field stands, the Democratic and Republican parties are about equally matched, and were there no other element, the issue would be doubtful. Neither is likely to put forward a candidate especially attractive or repugnant to Catholics. The Labor parties will draw many from both these parties, Catholics, Protestants and Infidels. It would be rash to say that the majority will be Catholic, or that it will be drawn from one side more than from another. The Prohibition vote will include few Catholics, but the number favoring that party, though steadily increasing, will be small compared to the others, unless the Labor party is split up into a number of petty organizations, frittering away the strength which a plausible Utopian scheme must always acquire at the outset, when it presents to the hard-working and struggling, even if improvident, laboring class, some scheme which is to make time, like eternity,

> "A blessed day
> When we shall not work but play."

Who the candidates for the Presidency, to be presented by the Conventions of 1888, will be, it is impossible even to conjecture. And not till they are fairly in the field can the effect of another element be at all calculated. This is the old Know Nothing organization. At the last election the machinery of the order, which had lain dormant, was revived, and from its central governing council orders were sent through the country commanding men who had ever been members to obey their oath and cast their votes against Mr. Blaine, who was the son of Catholic parents. Prominent Republicans in many parts felt obliged to withdraw their active support of the candidate of their choice. It was a bitter lesson to many who had unthinkingly bound themselves, years before, to find in sober manhood that they had made themselves the tools of unseen men, and laid aside the right to exercise their own judgment in selecting a chief magistrate of the country. That the number thus withdrawn from the Republican vote was very large, admits of no doubt.

It was counterpoised to some extent in New York by the disinclination on the part of many Catholics to vote for a man who, as Governor of the State of New York, had, it was charged, hesitated at a critical moment to facilitate the passage of a bill, not to give exclusive rights to Catholics, but to prevent bigoted and self-suffi-

cient officials in state penal or eleemosynary institutions, or institutions receiving state aid, from compelling inmates to attend a worship of their choice and manufacture, and from denying such inmates their right to worship according to the dictates of their conscience.

A tide against Mr. Cleveland was evidently setting in, several papers taking stand distinctly against him, when the Rev. Mr. Burchard unwarily said to Mr. Blaine words insulting to Catholics. The event, real or fictitious, was heralded over the country, and the Know Nothing organization chuckled to see Catholics aid them to carry out a scheme which sprang from hatred of Catholicity.

So far as regards the feelings of individual Catholics towards Mr. Cleveland, it would seem that the prejudice he excited by his unworthy course as Governor of New York has lost much of its strength. That he broke through a custom that had long prevailed of excluding Catholics from the diplomatic service of the country, and nominated a Catholic as minister plenipotentiary to Austria, is certainly creditable, while it was most dishonorable in that Catholic country to aid the anti-Catholic element in this country by playing into its hands and doing its behest in rejecting the gentleman nominated by Mr. Cleveland and approved by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Cleveland certainly showed a sense of his dignity in declining to nominate another American citizen to a post where he might be similarly insulted.

As long as the two great parties stood alone in the country, Catholics were very sparingly nominated for office, and where positions were reached by executive appointment the favor seldom fell upon a member of our faith. From all offices in the department of public education we have been systematically excluded, as a thing which we ought to feel grateful in being taxed for, but where we had nothing to say as to the manner in which the money was to be expended.

Politicians played on Catholics. As each party had a strong body of adherents who would not fail to "scratch" the name of a Catholic candidate, the political managers made this a pretext for not putting forward any of our people for fear of offending the susceptible enemies of the faith.

In the new Labor parties Catholics will be largely represented, and they should have their eyes open and watch very closely the manœuvres of their leaders. If the old political trick is to be tried, and Catholics ostracized by not being allowed to run for office, our people ought to have the sense to see and the spirit to resent it. If they are going to allow themselves to be used as mere tools to help to office men who scorn and despise them, they have

only themselves to blame. In the canvass of next year a Catholic voter will certainly have a choice of tickets and candidates. He will be deficient in common sense if he takes up with a party which shows any such proscriptive or unjust discrimination. In the regular parties an organization of scratchers would, after two or three elections, stop effectually the scratching of Catholic names. If it were known that the defeat, by scratching, of a Catholic on a ticket, where the rest of the candidates were elected, would be followed for five years by the concerted scratching of every candidate put forward by the party for that office, scratching would be found to be a losing game and would be abandoned.

Though there are Catholic office-seekers, experience shows that the Catholic body, as a whole, has never arrogantly demanded that, according to its numbers in the country, it should be represented in the list of those selected for executive, legislative, or judicial stations.

Catholics, as a body true to the religious training they received from youth, have never made their grievance a test or motive for action in exercising the elective franchise, but have cast their votes in a spirit of exalted patriotism, each giving his preference for the men and the measures which he deemed best adapted to secure the general good and the permanent welfare of the country. It has not been from among them that arose the men who combined to control great corporations that hold the country at their mercy, and they have never favored the corrupt legislation which such men have too frequently succeeded in obtaining to gather the wealth of the nation into the hands of a few and impoverish the many. It has always been a society seeking to relieve poverty, erecting and maintaining more charitable institutions for the relief of the helpless and destitute than all other denominations.

The course of Catholics in the past will best assure us as to their course in the election of next year. They will cast their ballots individually; they have no vote which political schemers can hope to gain by bestowing petty offices on a few noisy politicians who are unworthy to be classed as Catholics.

> "Some few apostates, who are meddling
> With merchandise, pounds, shillings, pence, and peddling."

THE CHARGE OF HERESY AGAINST DANTE.

Dante Hérétique, Revolutionnaire, et Socialiste, par Eugène Aroux. Paris, 1854.

Discorso sulla Divina Commedia, per Ugo Foscolo. London, 1825.

Sullo Spirito Antipapale, che produsse la Riforma, per Gabriele Rossetti. London, 1832.

Gli Eretici d'Italia, Discorsi Storici di Cesare Cantù. Discorso VII. Turin, 1865.

PROTESTANT polemics are so oppressed by the consciousness of the modern origin of their system that they would fain seek relief in the idea that the Lutheran movement was foreshadowed, at least, long before its author's time; that during the centuries when Roman influence darkened the Christian world, there were always a few pure spirits, some clear intellects, to cherish devotion to the true and the good, and who may, therefore, be regarded as precursors of the "Reformation." Alongside of Arnold of Brescia, John Huss, Jerome of Prague, and Wyklif, a place is given to Dante, child though he was, and pre-eminently, of Catholic theology and of Catholic philosophy. And it is remarkable that a few Catholic writers have also denied the orthodoxy of the first of poets. The most famous of these is the prince of paradoxists, the Jesuit Hardouin, who, in 1727, styled Dante an impostor wearing the mask of orthodoxy. In the time of Bellarmine there appeared "An Advice to Beautiful Italy," by a "French Nobleman," in which the author defended the thesis so flattering to the innovators. He was triumphantly refuted by the great controversialist; and also, in a "Reply to the Mystery of Iniquity" of M. Duplessis, by the able Dominican, Coeffeteau. The skeptical Bayle warns us to bear in mind that there are good reasons for doubt as to both the orthodoxy and heterodoxy of Dante. In our own day Ugo Foscolo and Gabriel Rossetti, men of much literary acumen, flattered the prejudices of their English hosts by proclaiming their great countryman "as desirous of reforming Christianity and Italy by means of heavenly revelations." But no author has shown more erudition in the ungracious task of aspersing the memory of the divine poet than Eugene Aroux, who arrives at the conclusion that Dante's works are socialistic, revolutionary and heretical. Cantù has ably refuted the arguments of Aroux, as, indeed, this

author seems to have admitted.[1] According to him, as well as according to Foscolo, Rossetti, etc., the Paterine sect was never entirely exterminated in Italy, but continued as a species of Freemasonry, preserving and transmitting certain doctrines—"mysteries of Platonic love," as Rossetti terms them—which tended to subvert the authority of the Church and of civil governments. Aroux thinks that this heresy was cherished by all the chivalry of the day, and especially by the survivors of the Templars, who, he insists, —and with some reason,—established a new school of Masonry. Dante thinks Aroux wished to show that the Papal supremacy was the visible kingdom of Satan, manifested in the "comedy of Catholicism." When Dante says that salvation will be his who follows "the pastor of the church," he signifies that we must obey the head of that hidden sect of which he was an adept. That is, Dante was a Templar, and devoted to a revenge of the suppression of his order. The word "love," says Aroux, is the key of all the mysteries in Dante's works. Francesca is something more than the mistress of Paolo; by her we must understand the poor little protesting church of Rimini, then a nursery of heresy. This is a strange theory. It is hard to understand how Dante would form so sublime a work, in which everything must always be taken in a sense different from the plain and natural one. And even though Aroux had given us the key to the poet's meaning, we cannot understand why Dante so frequently comments on himself in such a manner that the Guelphs must suppose one thing, the Ghibellines another.

Now, it is certain that in the time of Dante men did not regard him as a heretic, socialist, or (in the modern sense) a revolutionist. He died clothed in the habit of the Franciscans. His remains were lovingly laid to rest in a church, and a Papal legate—more recognizant than the poet's countrymen of his merit—erected a mausoleum to his memory. Immediately, all over Italy chairs were established and endowed for the explanation of the "Comedy," and often in churches. Thus, by a decree of the Florentine government, dated August 7, 1793, Boccaccio was appointed to such a chair in the church of St. Stephen.[2] By command of the fathers of the Council of Florence, the "Comedy" was translated into Latin prose by the Franciscan, John of Serravalle. In the Logge of the

[1] "The system of Aroux was not received by the studious; he complained that I was the only one in Italy who paid it any attention. I wrote him an open letter against his system, and he recognized in it not only a friendly courtesy, but certain arguments which he could not answer."—CANTU, *loc. cit.*

[2] MANNI: *History of the Decameron*, p. I., c. 29.—Boccaccio occupied this chair three years, and was succeeded by Antonio Piovano in 1381, and by Philip Villani in 1401. Bologna soon imitated Florence, and for ten years Dante was explained by Benvenuto dei Rambaidi. Pisa assigned the same charge to Bartolo da Bari, in 1385. (SALVINI; *Consular Annals of the Florentine Academy*, in preface. MAZZUCHELLI: *Italian Writers*, v. II., pt. 4. MURATORI: *Writers on Italian Matters*, v. XX.)

Vatican, our poet is depicted among the fathers of the Church. His portrait was hung in the church of Santa Maria del Fiore, in Florence, as it is now found in the façade of Santa Croce. "And when," remarks Cantù, "united Italy wished to celebrate, in 1865, the sixth centenary of his birth, the bitterness which has taken possession of our revolution manifested itself by proclaiming the hostility of Dante toward the Popes and religion. But while the official mob wallowed in such mud, the best thinkers and writers of Italy declared the truth, showing us Dante, the poet, angered against Boniface VIII., the personal enemy of the Pontiff's faction and indignant because of the abuses of the Papal court—then oppressed by kings and by demagogues; but ever reverent to the keys, and devoted to the faith of which Rome is the centre and the legitimate interpreter."

We propose to cite several of the many passages of the "Comedy" which prove Dante's orthodoxy. But before doing so, we would draw the attention of the reader to some facts which explain, though they do not justify, all the virulence which the poet manifests toward certain Pontiffs. Like nearly all unappreciated and persecuted men, Dante showed his humanity in peevishness and anger. Add to this that he was an intense Ghibelline, both by philosophy and in practice. He was heartily devoted to the idea of the emperor's universal monarchy, having nothing of the modern *Italianissimo* in his composition. All who opposed the emperor were mercilessly excoriated; witness his treatment of Lombardy, Genoa, Pisa, Pistoja, and his assignment of Brutus and Cassius to the lowest hell, alongside of Judas. He could condemn an emperor only when he would not visit "his" Rome, weeping because of her master's absence. Witness his curse on Albert.[1]

[1] In his "Italiani Illustri," art. *Dante* (Milan, 1873), Cantù asks whether the divine poet had any aspirations for Italian unity, and he replies: "Yes, but after his own fashion, and in accordance with his own philosophical, theological, juridical, ethical and political principles, which he always combined. In his mind, the law of movement and the end of the universe were in the unity of the creative order, as thought St. Augustine, in whose steps walked St. Thomas, considering the two cities of God and of the world as joined on earth, but after death separated, one leading to eternal felicity, and the other to unspeakable misery. The real sources of Dante's inventions were the "City of God," the "Summa" of the Angelic Doctor, and the "Itinerarium" of St. Buenaventura, which contemplate the world coming from God in creation; returning to Him and resting in Him. Wisdom creates the world, Providence moves it, Justice completes it. The foundation of right is found in order ("Monarchy," II., 7). Even in politics there is a unity which harmonizes the various human societies and leads them to itself. The human race is regarded as one individual forming a part of the order of creation, according to which his end is the knowledge of truth. To attain this, a tranquility of mind is necessary, and, therefore, universal peace is the proximate end of human society, and an indispensable means whereby the human race may obtain its end. Peace can be procured only when there is some person who will unite men according to their divisions in nations and states; a universal monarch, who is the principle of the unity of the human race as a civil society, just as the Pope is that

Again, Dante was a "White." The expulsion of this faction from Florence had been caused by the favor shown by Boniface VIII. to Charles of Valois; consequently Boniface was to be treated as an enemy. Finally, Dante combated not so much the pontiff-kings as he did the spirit of democracy. When he declaimed against Constantine, it was not because of the Romagna supposed to have been given to the Pope, but because of the imperial dignity which, according to the Guelphic pretensions of the poet's time, had been transferred to the Pontiff. He shows his mind in his "Monarchia," b. III., c. 10, where he reproves Constantine for leaving to the Popes the imperial power, which was one and indivisible. Again, Dante greatly extolled Charlemagne, the asserter of the Pope's temporal sovereignty; and he also exalted the countess Matilda, the most profuse of all donors of dominion to the Holy See. No, the reason for Dante's imperialism must be sought elsewhere than in hostility to the Pope's temporal patrimony. "Dante wished for reforms," says Cantù, "but he felt that they would be sterile without one supreme master over all human society, who would cause it to progress, who would draw from Christian principles their practical consequences. In the mind of Dante, the emperor should rule all kings, and, therefore, he should rule even the king of Rome; while Boniface VIII. and John XXII. claimed for themselves the imperial authority, especially when it was disputed."

He who is familiar with the writings of Dante can scarcely avoid an impression that his invectives against certain Pontiffs are prompted by his intense devotion to and his consummate respect for the chair they occupied. Sometimes, indeed, it is evident that he is actuated by party spirit; but, as a rule, he attacks only such

principle in the moral society. But earthly happiness is ordered toward eternal blessedness, the true end of society; hence the monarch ought to be subject to the Pope, as a son is to his father, and as the moon, a lesser luminary, depends on the sun, the greater luminary. There is no question, then, of an emperor according to the Ghibelline mind, but of a head unifying civil society, without violence, without interfering with the various states; one who will remove causes of disturbance and scandals; who will make the world more similar to God, by making it one; who will be above cupidity, and, therefore, a dispenser of justice to all, peoples and princes. This universal emperor is the continuator of the monarchy of the Romans, which was like a confederation of peoples preserving, under one head, their own institutions; a patronage rather than an empire ('*Patrocinium orbis terrarum potius quam imperium poterat nominari*'—*Mon.*, II., 5); and the world never was and never will be so perfectly ordered as when it was subject to the one prince and commander of the Roman people. So testifies the Evangelist St. Luke (*Conviv.*, IV., 5). Therefore, when Dante sees every Italian province at war, and even citizens of the same town in civil strife, he calls on the Roman emperor to come and restrain such ferocity, and to unify Italy in the peace of order, without any interference with the particular institutions of each province. Dante thought that such unity would ensure the greatest amount of liberty of life and movement; such unity was very different from the centralization advocated by modern mediocrities, and very far removed from the servility of the Ghibellines of his day."

Pontiffs as he deems guilty of acts bordering, at least, on simony; only such as he regards as abusers of the excommunicating power. An Italian, he was naturally and rightly averse to a removal of the Papal residence from the legitimate seat of the Papacy. This sentiment of indignation was unshared only by those who saw no injury, no insult, to the tiara in making it an appendage to the crown of a foreign ruler. All Italian authors of that day, from the saintly Catherine of Sienna to the buoyant Petrarch, cursed the wretched blunder of Clement V., and begged the Pope-kings to return to their proper and only legitimate home. It is true that Dante locates Pope Anastasius II. in hell, because of alleged sympathy with the heresy of Photinus ("Hell," cto. xi.); but the poet erred in accepting the authority of Martin the Pole, Gratian, and others, who asserted that Anastasius restored the Eutychian, Acacius, and communicated with the Acacian, Photinus. For it is certain, according to the testimony of Evagrius (b. iii., c. 23), Nicephorus (b. xv., c. 17), and Liberatus ("Nestorian Cause," c. 18), that Acacius died before the election of Anastasius II.; and that Martin the Pole, Gratian, etc., confounded Pope Anastasius II. with the emperor of the same name, who favored Acacius, and was killed by lightning. With this one exception, Dante's invectives against certain Pontiffs came from motives which have no relation with Catholic faith.

There is scarcely a heretical doctrine which Dante does not explicitly condemn; not one does he even implicitly favor. There is not one apparently anti-Catholic passage in his writings which must not be interpreted in a Catholic sense. We would prefer to quote the Italian text, but as that is not familiar to every reader, we shall use the English version by the Protestant Cary, warning the reader that in many instances the Anglican minister very much weakens the force of the original.

I. Hearken to Dante speaking of the Roman Pontiff, "Parad.," cto. 24:

> "O everlasting light
> Of him, within whose mighty grasp our Lord
> Did leave the keys."

And in "Hell," cto. 2;

> "It seems in reason's judgment well deserv'd;
> Sith he of Rome, and of Rome's empire wide,
> In heaven's empyreal height was chosen sire;
> Both which, if truth be spoken,[1] were ordain'd
> And 'stablished for the holy place, where sits
> Who to great Peter's sacred chair succeeds."

[1] Here Cary's Protestantism induces him to misinterpret, or at least to minimize, the poet's meaning. The text has "to tell the truth."—"*a voler dire il vero.*"

In "Hell," cto. 19, Dante thus addresses Pope Nicholas III.:

> "*If reverence of the keys restrain'd me not,*
> Which thou in happier time didst hold, I yet
> Severer speech might use."

In "Purgatory," cto. 20, he thus speaks of Sciarra Colonna's insults to Boniface VIII., much as he hated that Pontiff:

> "To hide with direr guilt
> Past ill and future, lo! the flower-de-luce
> Enters Alagna! in His vicar, Christ
> Himself a captive, and His mockery
> Acted again! Lo! to His holy lip
> The vinegar and gall once more applied!
> And He 'twixt living robbers doom'd to bleed!
> Lo! the new Pilate, of whose cruelty
> Such violence cannot fill the measure up.
> . . . . . .
> Oh, Sovran Master! when shall I rejoice
> To see the vengeance, which Thy wrath well-pleased
> In secret silence broods?"

In "Parad.," cto. 30, he thus recognizes the holy office even of Clement V., the cause of the "Babylonian Captivity":

> "Nor may it be
> That he who in the sacred forum sways
> Openly or in secret, shall with him
> Accordant walk; whom God will not endure
> I' th' holy office long."

II. "Parad.," cto. 5, Dante thus acknowledges the teaching authority of the Church:

> "Be ye more staid,
> O Christians; not, like feathers by each wind
> Removable; nor think to cleanse yourselves
> In every water. Either Testament,
> The Old and New, is yours; *and for your guide*
> *The shepherd of the Church. Let this suffice*
> *To save you.*"

And in the "Convivio," tr. iv., c. 5, Dante thus reproves heretics: "Most vile and most foolish little beasts, who presume to speak against our faith, and who wish to investigate the ordinances of God; accursed be ye, and your audacity, and all who follow ye!"

III. In "Parad.," cto. 25, he thus recognizes the necessity of good works:

> "Hope, said I,
> Is of the joy to come a sure expectance,
> Th' effect of grace divine *and merit preceding.*"

IV. In "Purg.," cto. 16, the free will of man is admitted:

"Brother, he began, the world is blind;
And thou in truth com'st from it. Ye, who live,
Do so each cause refer to heaven above,
E'en as its motion of necessity
Drew with it all that moves. If this were so,
Free choice in you were none; nor justice would
There should be joy for virtue, woe for ill,
Your movements have their primal bent from heaven;
Not all; yet said I all; what then ensues?
Light have ye still to follow evil or good,
And of the will free power."

V. In "Purg.," cto. 13, the souls in purgatory pray to the saints:

"And when we pass'd a little forth, I heard
A crying, 'Blessed Mary! pray for us;
Michael and Peter! all ye saintly host!'"

And in "Parad.," ctos. 32 and 33, Dante represents Mary's "own faithful Bernard" as exhorting him to pray to her:

"Grace then must first bé gain'd;
Her grace, whose might can help thee, then in prayer
Seek her; and with affection, whilst I sue,
Attend, and yield me all thy heart."

Then the poet pours forth his praises to the

"Virgin mother, daughter of thy Son,
Created beings all in loveliness
Surpassing, as in height, above them all;
. . . . . .
So mighty art thou, lady! and so great,
That *he who grace desireth, and comes not*
To thee for aidance, fain would have desire
To fly without wings."

Seldom, indeed, has Mary's intercessory power been more lauded than in this address, and if the reader will peruse it in its entirety he will probably agree with us in regarding it as not unworthy of a place in the liturgy of the Church.

VI. In "Parad.," cto. 5, Dante thus evinces his respect for the monastic vows:

"Of what high worth the vow, which so is fram'd
That when man offers, God well-pleas'd accepts;
For in the compact between God and him,
This treasure, such as I describe it to thee,
He makes the victim, and of his own act.
. . . . . .
The matter and the substance of the vow
May well be such, to that without offence,
It may for other substances be exchang'd,
But at his own discretion none may shift
The burden on his shoulders, unreleas'd
By either key, the yellow and the white."

Here, as in "Purg.," cto. 9, l. 118, Dante alludes to the golden key of science and the silver one of power, which the mediæval artists always placed in the hands of St. Peter. The idea, taken from the "Glossary in cap. 16 Matth.," was that, before using the absolving or dispensing power, the Pontiff should use the golden key of science to discover the true state of affairs.

VII. The whole "Purgatory" is a proof of Dante's belief in the Catholic Doctrine of a middle state of suffering for sin, and of the efficacy of prayer for the dead. But we would ask the reader's attention to the following passages. In "Hell," cto. 1, Virgil promises to consign Dante to the care of a more worthy spirit, who will lead him, after his visit to hell, to a region where he may view those

> "who dwell
> Content in fire, for that they hope to come,
> Whene'er the time may be, among the blest."

In "Purg.," cto. 26, a suffering soul begs the poet

> "say to Him
> One 'Pater Noster' for me, far as needs
> For dwellers in this world, where power to sin
> No longer tempts us."

And in cto. 11, our relations to the souls in purgatory are thus noticed:

> "Well beseems
> That we should help them wash away the stains
> They carried hence, that so, made pure and light,
> They may spring upward to the starry spheres."

VIII. Hear Dante's encomium on Sts. Francis and Dominick, the founders of the two great mendicant orders. In "Parad.," cto. 11, he says:

> "The Providence that governeth the world,
> In depth of counsel by created ken
> Unfathomable, to the end that she
> Who with loud cries was spous'd in Precious Blood,
> Might keep her footing toward the Well-Beloved,
> Safe in herself and constant unto Him,
> Hath two ordain'd, who should on either hand
> In chief escort her; one seraphic all
> In fervency; for wisdom upon earth,
> The other splendor of cherubic light.
> . . . . . .
> Forth on his great apostleship he (St. Dominick) fared;
> Like torrent bursting from a lofty vein;
> And, dashing 'gainst the stocks of heresy,
> Smote fiercest, where resistance was most stout."

Two passages, above all others, are confidently adduced as indicative of Dante's heresy. In "Hell," cto. 19, the poet addresses Pope Nicholas III. in these bitter terms:

"Your avarice
O'ercasts the world with mourning under foot
Treading the good, and raising bad men up,
Of shepherds like to you, th' evangelist ("Apoc.," 17)
Was ware, when her, who sits upon the waves,
With kings in filthy whoredom he beheld,
She who with seven heads tower'd at her birth,
And from ten horns her proof of Glory drew,
Long as her spouse in virtue took delight."

Nevertheless, Dante acknowledges Nicholas III. as supreme pastor:

"*If reverence of the keys restrain'd me not*
Which thou in happier time didst hold, I yet
Severer speech might use."

In "Purg.," cto. 33, Dante is said to exult in the coming of Luther:

"Without an heir forever shall not be
That eagle, he, who left the chariot plum'd,
Which monster made it first and next a prey.
Plainly I view, and therefore speak, the stars
E'en now approaching, whose conjunction, free
From all impediment and bar, brings on
A season in the which, one sent from God,
Five hundred, five, and ten, do mark him out,
That foul one, and the accomplice of her guilt,
The giant both shall slay."

Here Luther is supposed to be predicted in the "five hundred, five, and ten," the Roman numbers, D. V. X., forming the word *dux* (leader). And in the following passage the aspersers of Dante's name see the Roman Church in the "beast," and Luther in the *veltro*, "greyhound."

"This beast
At whom thou criest, her way will suffer none
To pass, and no less hindrance makes than death;
So bad and so accursed is her kind,
That never sated in her ravenous will,
Still after food more craving than before.
To many an animal in wedlock vile
She fastens, and shall yet to many more,
Until that greyhound come, who shall destroy
Her with sharp pain, He will not life support
By earth nor its base metals, but by love,
Wisdom, and virtue, and his land shall be
The land 'twixt either Feltro."

Much as we admire Dante, we are not disposed to credit him with the gift of prophecy. "Most of our poet's interpreters," says Lombardi,[1] "hold, either as certain or as probable, that the indicated leader is the emperor Henry VII." But Lombardi himself

[1] In his *Notes* on the *Comedy*, 3d Rom. edit., 1821, p. 484.

contends that Can Grande, Lord of Verona, is signified. And certainly the passage applies more naturally to Can Grande than to Luther. Dante shows us, in "Parad.," cto 22, that he relied on this great baron, the chosen leader of the Ghibelline league, to reform the world. Again, we know that Dante had received many favors from Can Grande, and it is quite likely that he would adopt this poetical and easy method of showing his gratitude. Finally, the indicated birthplace or residence of the leader cannot be assigned to the German friar; whereas Verona, the fief of Can Grande, was midway between Feltro of Romagna and Feltro of the Marca Trevigiana—"the land 'twixt either Feltro."

The passages above quoted are as strong as any adduced to show the heterodoxy of Dante. In fact, the only argument worthy of attention is the one based upon a supposition which is purely gratuitous; namely, that the "Comedy," like many other Italian and Provençal compositions, was conceived and executed according to a metaphorical system, in order to deceive the Inquisition. Such is the theory of Rossetti and of Aroux; and as the reader may be curious to know how it is developed, we shall show, by way of example, how the latter author interprets the interview between the poet and the spirit of the unfortunate Francesca de Rimini ("Hell," cto. 5). We must imagine Dante writing as follows, in the midst of his presumed grief for the persecution of the Waldensians of Rimini:

"How many sweet thoughts of peace and evangelical charity, how many hopes of a brighter future—'*quanti dulci pensier, quanto desio*,'—have our brethren nourished! And this has brought them to so fearful a fate—'*menò costoro al doloroso passo!*'—Oh, daughter of the valleys (*Valdese*), buried in grief, humble church so cruelly treated, thy martyrs inspire me with pity, and force me to feign orthodoxy—'*Francesca, i tuoi martiri a lagrimar mi fanno tristo e pio.*'—But tell me; when thou wert timidly desired by the noble hearts of Rimini—'*al tempo dei dulci sospiri*,'—how did they manifest their trembling yearnings—'*i dubbiosi desiri*,' for the religion of love? Then Francesca replies: If thou wouldst know the first germ of our love—'*la prima radice del nostro amore*,'—I, a poor Vaudoise obliged to feign orthodoxy, will tell you—'*come colui che piange e dice.*'—Thou knowest that our propaganda was effected by means of Provençal sectarian poems and romances. One day, while we were enjoying a reading—'*lettura*'—the text of which was taken from the Albigensian romance of Lancillotto, and which narrated how that knight of the Holy Grail embraced the religion of love—'*come amor lo strinse*'—we thought that no profane eyes were watching us—'*soli eravamo e senza sospetto.*'—Frequently, this teaching—'*quella lettura*'—(in French freemasonry, *instruc-*

tion) enthralled us—'*gli occhi ci sospinse*'—and at the same time, frightened us—'*scolorocci 'l viso*'; but one passage of that book triumphed over our hesitation—'*un punto fu quel che ci vinse.*'"—

When we read how the lover of the faith gave her the kiss of fraternity, and in exchange received from her the "consolation" (*consolamentum*)—"*il disiato riso esser bacciata da cotanto amante*"[1]—"Then this people of Rimini—'*cotanto amante*'—kissed me on the lips, adored me, and received from me the 'consolation,' although trembling for fear of Rome—'*la bocca mi baccio tutto tremante.*"

Let the reader compare this paraphrase with the original. Undoubtedly he will proclaim it ingenious, but just as surely will he deem it far-fetched and unwarranted. The strain to which the inventor subjected himself is evident in his work as a whole, and in every detail; its utter gratuitousness, its natural belonging to its native region of the "perhaps," is shown by an absolute and ever persistent absence of anything approximating to proof. Rossetti exercises his imaginative faculties over a larger field than that of Aroux; he devotes five volumes to convince us that the mediæval Italian poets were not at all erotic; that they were constantly engaged in manifestations of supernal truths—that their Beatrices,

---

[1] Speaking of the Waldensian Cathari, Aroux says that, in times of persecution this ceremony of consolation, "the most imposing in their ritual, was performed at night, and with great mystery. Numerous lighted torches symbolized the baptism of fire. The assembly was arranged in a circle (the perfect figure), and around a table covered with a white cloth, and serving as an altar (VAISETTE: *Proofs*, III., 224, 387). *The brethren assemble around the altar, and form a circle, leaving a space for the most excellent master* (*Light on Masonry*, 116). The minister, placed in the centre, gave to the neophyte the doctrinal instruction, blessing him thrice (as did St. Peter to Dante—*tre volte cinse*), and receiving from the new brother a promise of fidelity to the rules of the Cathari—an engagement similar to that of the Masons. Among other obligations, he bound himself never to sleep 'without shirt and drawers'—*sine camicia et bracis*, as did the Templars, and to be ever accompanied by his companion—*socius* (MARTENE, *New Anecd.*, F., 1776; *Arch. Inq. Carcass.*, 1243, Dt. 22, f. 110 a). The minister then gave the brother the Gospels to kiss, and invoked upon him the Paraclete. Then all the brethren recited the Lord's Prayer, and the service ended with the reading of the first seventeen verses of the Gospel of St. John,—a reading reproduced in certain degrees of Masonry. In token of his initiation, the brother received a linen or woolen cloth for a garment, 'to be worn over the shirt' (*Lib. Sent. Inq. Tolos.*, 247). Women wore a cord under the breasts (*Arch. Inq. Tolos*, 1273, Dt. 25, f. 60 a). It is remarkable that, in our day, the Masonic apprentice is introduced into the lodge of reception with one foot bare and the other sandaled, with a cord around the neck (*Light on Masonry*, 8), and the Mark Master wears the cord in four coils around his body (*Ibid.*, 96). The new Perfect received on his lips the 'kiss of fraternity,' and it was then passed around. The perfect ones, men and women, called each other brothers and sisters; Dante uses these terms, and with *frate* and *suora* instead of *fratello* and *sorella* (and so could any Italian, without incurring the suspicion of Catharism). All these ritualistic usages are perpetuated in Masonry, and are found in the *Comedy* with the most minute details."—*Proofs of the Heresy of Dante, drawn from the fusion, about* 1311, *between Albigensian Masonry, the Templars, and the Ghibellines;* Paris, 1857.

Lauras, etc., were not flesh and blood women, but symbols of a free and pure Church, unencumbered by the errors of Rome. But, says Cantù, "without descending to particulars, the slightest notion of æsthetics would cause one to reject a system which would make of poetry an allusion, not an inspiration; which would celebrate persons and charms which had no reality. And to what purpose? The multitude, for whom poetry is written, would not understand it; only the initiated would appreciate such allegories, and they are supposed to have already received a revelation of the mystery. And if they so carefully disguised their hatred of Rome, why did they afterwards burst into open invectives? It is very well to say that Dante calls upon sound intellects to admire the doctrines hidden under the veil of his verses, but why proclaim the allusions if they were to remain a secret? And if he dared not declare the truth, how could he boast of a voice which "reached the highest summits," and vaunt himself as "no timid friend of truth;" how could he hope, thereby, to be famous in the minds of those who would look upon his times as ancient? Would he not merit rather a place among the "ill spirits both to God displeasing and to His foes," or among the hypocrites who are "in the Church with saints, with gluttons at the tavern's mess?"[1]

[1] In the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1836, p. 400, vol. vii., series 4, Schlegel remarks: "The Middle Age had a great taste for allegory. It was manifested in painting, and dramatic poetry commenced with allegory. The personification of a general or abstract idea has nothing equivocal; but in poetry, despite its clearness, it is always somewhat cold. In order that an ideal being may appear real, it must assume individual traits. . . . . Dante, in his personification, so combined the ideal and individual character that they cannot be separated. It is the natural man who travels through the three regions where souls dwell; but it is also the poet Dante Alighieri, with all his biographical peculiarities. Virgil represents reason, unenlightened by revelation, but yet he is the Latin poet whom the Middle Ages revered as a great sage. Beatrice represents the science of divinity, but she is the same Beatrice Portinari whose chaste beauty made so profound an impression on Dante's youthful heart. Is there anything unlikely in this combination? The beautiful is a reflection of the divine perfections in the visible world, and, according to Platonic fiction, a pure admiration moves the wings of the soul toward the heavenly regions." Probably no modern author was better constituted, both by nature and by study, to appreciate Dante than Silvio Pellico. In one of his unedited poems, cited by Pianciani (*Ragionamenti*, 1840), and called *La Morte di Dante*, he says: "I have never been able to understand why Dante, simply because a few of his magnificent verses are animated by an angry spirit, appears to anti-Catholics to be one of their coryphees; that is, to be an enraged philosopher, not believing in Roman Christianity, or, at least, professing another faith. If the poem of the Florentine is read in good faith, and without party spirit, it will show that he was a thinker who was an enemy to schism and heresy, and submissive to all Catholic teachings."

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS.

Christianus es, in fronte portas signum Christi.

EVERY society or body of men, if at all numerous or important, possesses some distinctive sign. This sign may be known only to the members of the body, as is the case with Freemasons, or it may be manifest to all, as is the tonsure of the priest; it may consist in some peculiarity of dress, some badge to be worn, some act to be performed; but whether hidden or apparent, material or immaterial, there is always something to distinguish the member of a society from his fellow-men. The sign of the cross always has been, and ever will be, the special mark of the followers of Christ. As circumcision was amongst the Jews the exterior mark of the chosen people of God, so under the Gospel the sign of the cross is the exterior mark of the Christian people. We find it prefigured in the Old Testament by the sprinkling of blood on the transom and posts of the doors of the dwellings whereinto, on the Paschal night, the destroyer was not to enter; and, still more clearly, in the letter *Thau*, T, one form of the cross, which Ezekiel was to mark on the foreheads of the men who mourned over the abominations committed in their city. Some of the fathers are of opinion that our Lord gave this sign on His ascension to the apostles, and that they taught the people everywhere to use it; at any rate, there is abundant proof that from the very earliest ages of the Church, while the symbol of our salvation was an emblem of obloquy, an object of contempt and aversion to mankind in general, and long before the cross, either carved or painted, *crux exemplata*, found a place on the walls of every Christian house, the sign of the cross, made with the hand, *crux usualis*, was employed by the members of the Church to denote that they were Christians, and distinguished them from the Jews and heathen amongst whom they lived and with whom they mingled. St. Epiphanius, speaking of a woman who was subjected to some vain enchantments, says: "She, being a Christian, crossed herself in the name of Christ" (Haer. 30). "If man does ask a catechumen," says St. Augustine (Tract ii. in Joan.), "Does man believe in Christ? he replies, 'I believe in Him,' and makes the sign of the cross." And in another place (Serm. 53, De Verbo Dei): "We recognize the members of Christ because they bear the sign of Christ." The phrase, *portare crucem in fronte*, recurs frequently in the writings of

the early Christian apologists and fathers, and in some cases received a literal interpretation, for in the days of persecution those Christians who were condemned to work in the mines had a cross stamped on their foreheads.[1] A custom seems, too, to have existed at one time in the East of branding Christian children on the forehead, in order that they might be recognized if carried away into captivity.

The sign of the cross was originally made with the thumb of the right hand on the forehead only, or on the forehead, lips and breast. On the forehead, because it is not only the noblest part of the human frame, the seat of the intellect, but also because it is the most conspicuous. There a man's character is said to be inscribed, and there the flush of shame, the fear of disgrace first writes itself. What place, then, more fitting for that sign which proclaims that he is not ashamed to confess Christ crucified, which seals His dedication to God in the Christian church? "He placed his sign on my forehead," says St. Agnes, speaking of her celestial Spouse, "that I should admit no other lover." "Have Christ in your hearts and His mark upon your foreheads," was a Christian proverb. The act of crossing oneself was accompanied by an invocation of the three persons of the Holy Trinity, either severally or together, or of the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; by the words, *adjutorium nostrum*, etc., or some formula of renunciation of evil: "I renounce thee, O Satan, and thy pomp and service, and I enrol myself as thine, O Christ. As thou sayest this make the sign of the cross on thy forehead" (Chrysostom, or. 21 ad pop. Antioch.). It was made with the right hand, as being the worthier and more honorable, at first with one finger only, and later, when this method became unorthodox, owing to the monophysites and other heretics quoting it in support of their doctrine of the single nature of Christ, with the whole hand, to signify, as Durandus suggests, the five wounds of our Lord; or with three fingers, in reference to the Holy Trinity; or with two, to denote the twofold nature of the God made man. About the eighth century the primitive manner of making the cross was supplanted by the more elaborate one of raising the hand to the forehead, lowering it to the breast, and passing it first to the left shoulder and then to the right. The movement from the head to the breast signifies the descent of Christ from the height of heaven to the Virgin's womb; from

[1] In the Dict. des Antiquités Chrétiennes, Martigny mentions a painting on glass, the bottom of a drinking vessel, found in the catacombs, bearing the inscription, *libernica*, and the bust of a young man on whose brow a Greek cross is imprinted. This is explained as perhaps intended to indicate his sanctity, the mark of the Lamb on his forehead; but most probably it is to betoken him as one of those who were sentenced *ad metalla*.

right to left shows how the Son of God removes us from the goats on the left to the sheep on the right, from the kingdom of death to life eternal; we finish on the breast to signify that the cross and the Crucified are to be always in our heart.[1] "It is on our brow that we may confess Christ, on our heart that we may love Him, on our arm that we may work for Him," says St. Ambrose (Lib. de Isaac et Anima, 8). The Greeks taught that the hand should be passed from right to left, because the Son is seated at the right hand of the Father, and the Holy Ghost on the left; but this manner of making the cross was condemned by Innocent III., who expressly prescribed that the cross in the Mass should be made from left to right, and this practice has since been followed in the Latin Church.

But the sign of the cross in the early days of Christianity was by no means regarded as a profession of faith alone, otherwise it would have fallen into disuse when the Pagan empire was overthrown and all nations became Christian; and the Puritans might have been justified when, on separating themselves from the Church, they abolished the use of this sign, urging the altered circumstances of the times, and comparing it to the brazen serpent destroyed by Hezekiah's command. On the contrary, we find that the faithful were exhorted to employ it as a defence in danger, an encouragement in suffering, a remedy in sickness; above all, as a means of stilling unholy passions and resisting sinful desires. "The flesh is signed that the soul may be fenced," writes Tertullian. And St. Cyril: "We make the sign of the cross to recall all that is good and virtuous." The sign of the cross was the habitual accompaniment of the Christian's daily life, no action being considered too ordinary or too oft-recurring to be preceded and followed by it. Not only did they cross themselves on forehead, eyes, lips and breast, on rising up and lying down, on going out and coming in, but they made the same holy sign on the garments they wore, the food they ate, the cup from which they drank, the couch on which they rested, the instruments and implements of their toil or handicraft. The works of the Christian writers of the first five centuries abound with passages showing how constant and widespread was its use. "We ought, on rising, to give thanks to God, and perform all our daily work with the sign of the cross," says St. Ambrose (Serm. 43). "And St. Jerome: "Whatever thou doest, wherever thou goest, let thy hand make the sign of the cross" (ad Eustoch. Ep. 22). "Before undertaking any work, at every step or movement, when we go in or out, when we dress or put on our shoes, at the bath, at the table, when lights are brought, when we go to bed,

---

1. Gretser, De Cruce, l. 4, c. 5.

when we sit down, whatever it is that occupies us, we mark our forehead with the sign of the cross" (Tertullian, de. Cor. Mil.). Some superstitious custom seems to have been connected with putting on the shoes, which the sign of the cross was to replace, as at the commencement of meals it was substituted for the idolatrous usages of the heathens, who placed their gods before them at table. St. Augustine asserts that the sign of the cross is referred to by St. Paul, when, writing to Timothy, he says that every creature is to be sanctified by the Word of God and prayer; at any rate, it was the ordinary method whereby objects that had been employed for idolatrous purposes were purified, and meats offered to idols rendered fit for the food of the faithful.

And if every action, even the least and most trivial, was thus to be sanctified, how much more must the Christian have recourse to this sacred sign under exceptional circumstances of trial and temptation, on special occasions of danger and difficulty. If anything important was to be said, the speaker crossed himself before commencing his discourse. If the Christian heard words of blasphemy uttered, he smote his breast and made the sign of the cross, as when alarmed by tempests or any sudden peril. It was made over the sick to alleviate their sufferings, and again when the hour of death drew near. St. Jerome says of St. Paula, that when the sign of the cross was made on her breast, her pains seemed to abate. It formed the affectionate farewell of friends when parting for a lengthened period, or on any solemn occasion, a custom the memory of which still lingers in the German farewell salutations: "Behüt' dich das heilige Kreuz"; "Gesegne dich Gott." Soldiers, going to battle, crossed themselves when the trumpet sounded for the fight, to show that they trusted less in the strength of the sword than in the name of Christ. The martyrs crossed themselves in the presence of their judges, when asked if they were Christians; again, in the hands of their executioners they crossed themselves, this proving in many instances the means of delivering them from injury. We read in the "Martyrology" that St. Tiburtius (20 Jan.), after making the sign of the cross, walked unhurt over burning coals. St. Vitus (15 June), being thrown into a fiery furnace, came out uninjured, having made the sign of the cross; and when exposed to a raging lion, he tamed him with the same holy sign, so that the fierce animal licked his feet. Of St. Tecla (23 Sept.) it is said that, when thrown upon the fire, she made the sign of the cross, and a violent downpour of rain extinguished the flames. The acts of the saints furnish innumerable examples illustrating the piety wherewith the early Christians made the sign of the cross, the confidence they reposed in it, the wonders that were worked by it. By means of it St. Julian (9 Jan.) deprived poison

of its deadly power, and St. Remigius (13 Jan.) arrested a vast conflagration in the city of Rheims. St. Mary of Egypt (8 April), on making the sign of the cross, was able to traverse the Jordan, walking over its stormy waters in order to receive the Holy Eucharist from the hands of Zozimus. St. Procopius (8 July) made the sign of the cross before the statues of certain heathen deities, and they were cast out and broken in pieces without human hands. St. Benignus (1 Nov.), in the same way, caused the wood and stones and vessels prepared for offering sacrifice to idols to vanish into smoke. In like manner St. Amandus (6 Feb.) put to flight a monstrous serpent, and banished it from the isle it infested. He also, by the sign of the cross, restored sight to a woman struck blind for adoring idols. Pope Cœlestine (10 May) thus healed a woman paralyzed in both hands, and John, Archbishop of York, made a dumb man to speak by making the sign of the cross on his tongue. And as the powers of nature were dominated by the virtue of this holy sign, in like manner evil spirits were unable to resist it. "The devils cannot approach to them on whom they see this heavenly mark," writes Lactantius (Inst. l. 4, c. 27), "nor can they hurt those whom this heavenly sign, as an impregnable fortress, defends." It was thus the monks of the desert used to put the devil to flight when he appeared to tempt them under various forms, as man or brute, fawn or satyr. "Let him who wishes for proof," says St. Athanasius (De Incarn. Verbi Dei, c. 48), "use the sign of the cross, and he will see how the demons are put to flight by it, how the oracles cease, and all magic and witchcraft are brought to naught." It was also the usual form of exorcism; St. Theodoret, the Archimandrite, is said thus to have expelled an unclean spirit from a boy who was possessed (22 April). Even when employed by unbelievers and those who are opposed to the Christian religion, the cross was not without effect on the powers of evil, as was seen in the case of Julian the Apostate, Josephus, and other Jews of whom Theodoret and St. Gregory Nazianzen speak. This fact, as well as that of its use being recommended on all occasions, is brought forward by Gretser (De Cruce, l. 4) as proof that the cross has power *ex opere operato;* he admits, however, that the effect of the sign is enhanced by the piety and virtue of the user, and the name of Christ more powerful when invoked with the heart as well as the lips.

Many passages might be quoted from the pages of early writers to show that from the first the sign of the cross was, as it still is, a marked feature of Christian worship, both in the general devotions and, preëminently, in the administration of the sacraments. By this sign of the Lord's person, the body of Christ is consecrated, the fount of baptism sanctified, priests are initiated, the

other orders conferred, churches dedicated, and altars consecrated. It was considered as an essential part of the sacraments: "Unless the sign of the cross is made either on the foreheads of the faithful, or on the water wherewith they are regenerated, or on the oil with which they are anointed, or on the sacrifice with which they are nourished, none of these things are duly performed," is the dictum of St. Augustine (Hom. 118, in Joan.). St. Cyprian, speaking of baptism, says: "Whoever may be the minister of the sacrament, of whatever sort may be the hands that immerse the candidates, by whatever lips the words are uttered, it is the authoritative sign of the cross which works the effect." (De Pass. Christi.) It was the token of admission into the Church, the giving up of the catechumen to Christ, the sign and seal of passing from the state of sin to the state of grace. In baptizing, the priest first made a cross upon the catechumen's forehead, and, after the renunciation was pronounced, on his breast and head also, with olive oil, using the words: "Take the sign of the cross, both on forehead and breast;" for the heart of man, being the seat of error and vices when possessed by the devil, is made the abode of faith, hope, and charity when illumined and defended by Christ.[1] The original form of words varies according to the different rites, likewise the number of times the cross was to be made. In the Cologne rite it was repeated as many as seven times, on different parts of the person, each sign having its special signification: on the head of the catechumen, to show that he adopts the faith of Christ; on his ears, that he may hear the divine command; his eyes, that he may see the light of God; his nostrils, that he may perceive the sweet odor of Christ; his mouth, that he may speak the words of life; his heart, that he may believe in God; and his shoulders, that he may take Christ's yoke upon him.[2] Immediately after the immersion, the neophyte was again anointed with consecrated oil on the forehead by the bishop, if it was possible for him to be present. This was the sacrament of confirmation. Gregory of Tours tells how Clodovic was baptized and then anointed with sacred chrism with the sign of the cross of Christ. The ancient formula of confirmation was: Take the sign of Christ to eternal life; or: In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. But this varied, until Pope Eugene IV. (1439) fixed the formula since in use throughout the whole Church.

In the ordination of priests, the laying on of hands was in the form of the cross, not merely *consignatio*, but *consignatio cruciformis*

---

[1] See Augusti, Denkwürdigkeiten, v. 7, p. 295-7. Also, Martene, De Ant. Eccl. Rit. 4, l. art. 13.

[2] Binterim, Denkwürdigkeiten, v. 1. p. 22.

(Dion. Areop. de Hier. Eccl., c. 5), to express that the priest is to imitate the life of Christ. The sacred vestments are also blessed with the sign of the cross. When, towards the end of the first century, the Church's blessing first became an adjunct to the nuptials of her children, the union of man and wife was sealed and sanctified by the same sign, in consequence of which St. Andrew Cretensis calls the cross *conjugii vinculum*, the bond of wedlock. It is also sometimes termed the sign of blessing, because the benediction, given to the people in the time of the Patriarchs with outstretched hands, under the new dispensation is given with the sign of the cross. Penance and extreme unction, also, like the other sacraments, are nothing unless accompanied by the sign of the cross, because the reconciliation of the sinner cannot be effected without it.

There still remains to speak of the use of the sign of the cross in the sacrifice of the Mass, which is both ancient and universal. The officiating priest crosses himself repeatedly, as well as the book, the altar, the offerings and oblations, and the people when he gives the benediction at the close. The different revisals of the "Ordo Romanus" decree differently as to the number of times of making the sign. The first mentions the cross to be made on the forehead at commencing, as well as three times over the elements at the consecration, as ordered by the Apostolical Constitutions. According to the Roman Missal now in use, the cross is to be made fifty-five times in the celebration of High Mass. In the liturgy of St. Mark it appears that the cross was made in the Creed at *Et incarnatus est*, at *crucifixus etiam pro nobis*, and again at *in spiritum sanctum;* and in that of St. James it was made by the priest over the elements at the *Sanctus*. From old records we learn that it was formerly, in some places, the custom for the deacon or priest, when about to commence the Gospel, to cross himself on forehead, lips, and breast, and for the people, standing up to show respect to the word of God, to do the same as a profession of faith. Gretser[1] says that it is related of St. Martin that when he made the sign of the cross in the prayer of consecration, his whole arm and hand shone with light to show the divinity of the act, which has also been attested by many other miracles.

That the sign of the cross should be employed in the celebration of Mass, to bless the unconsecrated bread and wine, occasions no surprise, accustomed as we are to its use in Christian ceremonial as a means of sanctification; but the reason why it should be employed subsequent to the consecration, when the elements have become the Most Holy Body and Blood of Christ, is less obvious,

[1] De Cruce, l. 4, c, 16.

since it would be absurd to suppose that any added sanctity could be conferred upon the Sacred Host by the blessing of the Priest. What, then, is the meaning of the sign of the cross when employed after the consecration? Bishop Hefele enumerates several explanations which have been suggested,[1] neither of which taken singly, however, does he consider as satisfactory when applied to all the occasions when the sign of the cross is made over the consecrated elements. The first is that of St. Thomas, who says that it is to commemorate the power of the cross and the form of Christ's passion, to signify, that is, the blessing that flows to us from them. This explanation holds good in regard to the first seven times that the cross is made by the Priest subsequent to the consecration, namely, the five in accompaniment of the words: *hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitæ æternæ, et calicem salutis perpetuæ;* and the two later on at the words: *Ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus.* A second explanation is that the sign of the cross was originally made to bless the eulogia, or blessed bread placed upon the altar, and then given to the faithful who did not receive communion, the sign still remaining though the eulogia are abolished. This applies to the crosses at the words: *Per quem hæc omnia, Domine, semper bona creas, sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis et præstas nobis.* A third explanation is founded on the general custom of making the sign of the cross on naming the Persons of the Holy Trinity; and here we have the reason why it is made at the words: *Per ipsum, et cum ipso, et in ipso,* etc. The three first times it is made with the host over the chalice, because Christ is present in both. The cross thrice repeated at the words: *Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum,* may be explained in much the same manner as those immediately after the consecration, as signifying the blessing accruing to the faithful from the passion of Christ. A fourth suggestion, taken from Kössing's work on the Mass, quoted by Bishop Hefele, but acknowledged by him to be insufficient to account for the use of the sign of the cross in the celebration of the holy sacrifice on all occasions, is that it is intended to express the identity of the victim offered upon the altar with the one who suffered upon the cross. Other and more mystic significations have also been given, but these may be regarded rather as a pious afterthought than the real reasons why the use of the sign of the cross was decreed in the liturgy of the Mass.

When the "mummeries of the Mass" and the other ceremonies of the Church, authorized by tradition, confirmed by custom, observed by faith, were swept away at the "Reformation," the sign of the

[1] Beiträge, vol. ii. p. 286.

cross, too, was abolished as being of human, not divine, ordinance. Not wholly abolished, however, for, strangely enough, the Lutherans retained it in the consecration of the bread and wine as well as the giving of peace at the close of the Communion service; the Episcopalians also, in England, thought fit to retain its use in the baptismal, though not in the Communion service, thereby giving great offense to Puritan zealots, as Hooker testifies.[1] "To some," he says, "it hath seemed almost an unpardonable oversight to retain the dangerous sign of the cross. To sign children's heads with the cross in token that they shall not hereafter be ashamed to make profession of the faith of Christ, is to bring into the Church a new word, whereas there ought to be no doctor heard in the Church but our Saviour Christ. . . . . For although it be the word of God that we should not be ashamed of the Cross of Christ, yet it is not the word of God that we should be kept in remembrance of it by two lines drawn across each other on the child's forehead." Hooker himself is ready to acknowledge the good and profitable use of this ceremony, and maintains that "we are by no means bound to relinquish the sign and ceremony of the cross as superstitious."

Those who rashly refuse to sign themselves with the sign of Christ, in their folly fail to see that the Scriptures, on which they profess to rest their beliefs, repeatedly describe those as marked of God on the forehead whom His mercy will preserve from final confusion and shame; with what are they marked, but with the sign of the cross? Furthermore, in the last great persecution of the Church foretold in the Apocalypse, this sacred sign will be the mark which will be opposed to the mark of the heart, and will distinguish the followers of Christ from the followers of Antichrist. For, as we are distinctly told, that last and greatest enemy of the Christian Faith will also have his sign whereby his adorers may be known, a character which he will imprint in their right hand, or on their forehead, wherewith he will seek to obliterate the memory of the cross, to abolish the sign of the cross, and finally prevent its use.

---

[1] Eccl. Polity, 5, 65.

THE LAST IRISH STRUGGLE.

THE last struggle for Irish liberty is taking place at this hour on the soil of Ireland. Nobody on either side doubts this. The Tories themselves know that it is their last chance. If they do not succeed, then the return of Mr. Gladstone to power is inevitable; and the return of Mr. Gladstone means the immediate concession of Home Rule. Even if that great statesman were not as deeply committed to Home Rule as he is, even if his never tarnished honor were to be dishonored by an abandonment of the Home Rule platform, Home Rule would still be inevitable. The English people will not endure the continual distraction of their country, the cessation of all their business, the demoralization of their Parliament, and the scorn of the whole civilized world for another period of five years; and altogether, irrespective of the rivalries and the claims of politicians, there will certainly rise from the many-throated democracy, before long, a hoarse, imperative, angry roar that Ireland must be got out of the way. It is this that largely accounts for the desperation of the efforts put forward on the side of the Ministry. On the other hand, the Irish people and the Irish leaders are sensible of the vast consequence of the struggle. They feel that if a Tory government were able to show that coercion could conquer Ireland and govern Irishmen, the policy of coercion might endure for some years; and even a few years may bring any number of those mishaps which have dogged Irish effort throughout all the centuries.

For these and many other reasons, there is infinite interest in the battle that is now being fought out in Ireland. The whole world feels the intensity of the interest. In spite of the fact that Ireland has been the beginning and the end of everything for the last ten years or more, the English journals devote the largest amount of their space still to Irish affairs. The *Times* publishes every day columns of verbatim reports of Irish trials, the cross-examination of a policeman or an informer, the speeches even of Irish barristers,—things that practical journalists know are rarely given more than a few lines in the crowded columns of newspapers,—all find as much space in the leading London organs as if they were sensational murders or highly scandalous divorce cases. Nearly every one of the London journals, too, is represented in Ireland by special correspondents who send elaborate and more or less accurate descriptions of everything in Irish life. Even Irish scenery is, almost for the first time,

beginning to have charms for English eyes, and the London reporter is laboriously describing for the London public those sights and sounds in Ireland that have been familiar to Irish eyes and Irish ears for centuries. The same thing is true of political addresses. Going down to a contested election a short time ago, we asked the local "wirepuller" what was the subject upon which the people would most desire to hear a speech. We had begun by this time to think that Ireland would have almost stunk in the nostrils of English audiences by the annoying iteration of the theme, and our inclination was to speak to them of some of their own grievances and some of the reforms which they themselves demanded. The reply of the electioneerer was that Ireland was what the people wanted to hear about. It was the first question, the great question, the only question, he said. Such a strain, of course, upon the attention and passions of a democracy it is impossible to keep up for a long time, and this monopoly of speaking and writing on the Irish question at the present hour is one of the many factors which will produce the urgent demand for immediate settlement to which we have already alluded. The present struggle is engaging, apart from the tragic Irish interests involved, from the light it throws upon the English character. Many times already in the columns of this REVIEW we have ventured upon a forecast of what course the English people would take when the Irish question was brought before them by one of their own statesmen. The strongest factor, we have always thought, in favor of the conquest of English opinion was the absolute ignorance of the English people upon the tragic story of Ireland's wrongs. The speeches of Mr. Gladstone and other Liberal leaders have come upon the English people not as a repetition of a wornout and too familiar theme, but as a revelation of a new world of fact and suffering and wrong. This accounts for the extraordinary responsiveness, especially of the English masses, to Mr. Gladstone's appeals. After all, the English people were at bottom generous and inclined to do right; and they do wrong, at least in the present age, rather from blundering incapacity, imperfect appreciation, or profound ignorance, than from malice. The whole history of the English people, at least in the present century, is one of quick and almost effusive reconciliation with enemies they once hated and once fought. Indeed, in all there is a tendency to proportion the bitterness of our repentance according to our sense of bitterness for wrong we have done. It is a noble form of reaction in which the human soul everywhere abounds. One has seen many instances of this in recent English history. To take one recent instance: The very people that applauded for awhile the disastrous enterprise which broke up the kingdom of Cetewayo, were ready a year or two afterwards to lionize that monarch when he came to

London. There is something of the same kind of feeling in the English mind at the present moment towards the Irish people, and even still more towards the Irish members. There has been no public man of his time who has passed through such fierce hurricanes of personal attack as has Mr. Parnell. For years he was perhaps the man whom the English people most hated. We well remember the time when, sitting beside him, we passed through the streets of Manchester amid a tempest of howls from English lips. All this has been completely changed, and at the present moment there is no politician who has a greater hold upon the respect of the English people than Mr. Parnell. In the elections of 1885 he received enthusiastic receptions wherever he went, and now the mention of his name at public meetings is certain to evoke the heartiest cheers. The same thing takes place with regard to the rank and file of his party. Indeed, the position of the Irish members at the present moment in English politics is one of the most eccentric of modern political phenomena. Mr. Parnell had reason, some months ago, to establish an agency, the sole purpose of which is to receive and consider applications from English constituencies and Liberal organizations for Irish members, and the applications are at least quadruple the possibilities of supply. Even where an English meeting is able to obtain the services of a Cabinet Minister, a peer, or a great law officer like Sir Charles Russell, there is still the same cry for the Irish Nationalist. It has been confessed by English politicians themselves who are the most bitter enemies of Irish claims, that the by-elections which have gone so badly against the Union Ministry have been mainly won through the speeches or the appearance on English platforms of members of Mr. Parnell's party. This, of course, is made the more remarkable from the fact that in the present year the deadliest attack was made upon them to which they have been subjected during the storms of the decade which is drawing to its close. Even at this hour the *Times* newspaper has the boldness to still advertise its villanous articles in which the Irish members were accused of being the accomplices of assassins, and which contain the clumsy forgery connecting Mr. Parnell with the Phœnix Park murders. But so far as these things have had any effect, undoubtedly it has been only to make Mr. Parnell and his followers still more popular than they were before. The demand for their presence is on the increase every day, and if Mr. Parnell had eighty-six orators in his party, there is not one of them who would not find ten times more work than any one politician could do. To sum it all up, the Irish Nationalist is the English lion of the present political hour.

The sympathy with the cause of Mr. Gladstone and of Ireland

has caught even classes that might be expected to be hostile or at least indifferent. Everybody knows how keenly the Dissenting sects of England, and still more of Scotland, resent the claims of the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, Mr. Gladstone has no followers more united, more active, than the Dissenting clergymen. At this moment, indeed, there is scarcely a Nonconformist clergyman of eminence that is not on the side of Home Rule. Mr. Spurgeon is silent, and probably neutral; Mr. Chamberlain still keeps on his side the clergyman at whose chapel he and his family worship; but, with one or two exceptions like these, the Dissenting churches are, to a man, in favor of Home Rule. Even among the clergy of the Establishment Home Rule has its adherents, and if they be comparatively few in number, they are at least fervent in spirit. At a visit to Cambridge University, the other day, we met a young curate of the Church, who lived down in a remote part of Cornwall where the enemies of Irish rights are especially powerful. When we mentioned Home Rule to him, his whole face was lit up with the enthusiasm of faith, and he declared that Home Rule with him was part of his religion. It is right to dwell upon the strength of Mr. Gladstone among the Dissenters, and especially among their clergymen, because it was the apprehension of Dissenting clergymen and laymen of importance that largely led to the defeat of Mr. Gladstone's first appeal to the English constituencies. They were the abstentionists, whose absence from the polls enabled the Tories to win seats in London and the populous centres where, at the election of 1885, the Liberals had been returned by large majorities. The days of Liberal abstention are past. Whenever the next appeal comes to the English constituencies, the Liberal party will vote solidly, and its solid vote will be given for Home Rule. As to the working-classes, they remain where they were, or rather their feelings are rising higher every day. With a keenness of instinct that seems to belong to democracies, they saw in the Irish struggle its influence upon their own struggle for their own rights. The follies of the present administration have done much to increase this feeling. The cynic brutality with which the renegade Home Ruler, who is now Home Secretary, treated the destruction of a poor workwoman's reputation, the domiciliary visits of the police to English homes and English meetings, have developed the feeling that the present Government is an enemy of the people, both English and Irish. The scenes enacted in Ireland, to which I shall have to allude more largely by-and-by, have stirred the bitter and passionate resentment of wrong, which is stronger among toilers than any other class of a community, and to-day it is true to say that the policy of the Gov-

ernment and its members is almost as detestable to vast masses of English artisans as to the evicted tenants of Ireland.

The story of the by-elections is already well known in America. They all tell the same tale. The Liberal party has not only recovered the abstentionists, but it has caught that shifting ballast of not particularly strong politicians that usually turn elections. Even North Huntingdon, which the Tories won, speaks as vehemently as Spalding of the enormous advance of Mr. Gladstone's power. Of course, it would have been better to have won it; but, next to a good victory comes a good fight, and to reduce the Tory majority from what it was in 1885, when there was no division in the Liberal party, to bring them close to a defeat in a constituency where a Tory family had occupied the seat for a century, was an extraordinary result. Within the last few weeks several incidents have happened which show the anxiety of the Tories, and, indeed, their sense that the case has gone against them in the constituencies.

Your readers are familiar with the odious scandal which has filled the columns of the English and American press for some days. There is no doubt that, under ordinary circumstances, Col. Hughes-Hallet would have been called upon by his own party to immediately retire from the seat. Even such palliation of his offence as is involved in not pressing him to withdraw from Parliament, must seriously damage the party of which he is a member and the Government of which he is a supporter. In the face of these facts, the Tory authorities, both at headquarters and in the constituency of Rochester which he represents, have used all their influence to induce him to retain his seat; and a man who would not find his way probably into any club in London, whose presence in the drawing-room would threaten the immediate withdrawal of every other guest, and who, in fact, has already notified them that he intends to escape from the odium of his own acquaintances by withdrawing to the Continent, is still retained as a member of the highest assembly in the country. The meaning of this, of course, is, that the Tories fear the effect of another appeal to the constituents, and believe that if such an appeal took place, it would result in the return of a supporter of Mr. Gladstone. Similar tactics have been employed with regard to the constituency of Deptford. Mr. Evelyn, its present representative, is a Tory—but he is a Tory with a conscience, and he pledged himself against coercion before he was elected. He did so with the knowledge, and even at the instance, of the Tory leaders, and he now finds himself between the awkward alternatives of breaking his word or disobeying his party. He also has been anxious for months to wash his hands of responsibility for crimes and follies which both his sense and his heart condemn, and he has been unable to do so.

The fear of the return of a Liberal has induced his political friends almost to compel his continuance in Parliament. Any chance, indeed, of allowing the people to declare their opinion is dreaded by the Tories, and this dread speaks as eloquently as an electoral victory of what is the prevalent feeling of the majority of the English people at the present moment.

There are many things to account for this undeniable change in public opinion. It is notorious that the Tories and Liberal Unionists alike pledged themselves in language the most positive against coercion at the last general election. Their promises, in this respect, are more important, not merely as showing their own dishonesty, but as forecasting their sense of the opinions and tendencies of the English people. They would not have pledged themselves against coercion if they had not the feeling that coercion was a policy which the English nation would not stand, and they have proved to be correct prophets. We now have a policy of coercion, and it is pretty plain that the English people do not intend to stand it. But the fact remains that the Tories have violated their pledges, and this has assuredly led to a strong sentiment of disgust and disappointment in the English constituencies. The idea among many people—especially among people who combined a certain kindliness of feeling with a certain muddle-headedness—that Mr. Gladstone had gone unnecessarily far, that this was a case for a compromise, and that Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington, between them, might be expected to elaborate a scheme which would give the Irish all they had a right to get and at the same time not break up the unity of the country. This was the kind of thing that was promised in nearly every Tory speech. No statement of Mr. Gladstone and the Gladstonians was more strenuously denied by the Tories and the Unionists than the statement that between such Home Rule as Mr. Gladstone proposed, on the one side, and coercion on the other, there was no middle path. The middle path was promised effusively and vehemently, though, of course, a little vaguely. Mr. Chamberlain was emphatic in the declaration that he was a Home Ruler in principle, not only at that hour, but long before Mr. Gladstone adopted his new creed. The Marquis of Hartington could be satisfied with the admission of four conditions—some of them, at least, quite admissible even by an ardent Home Ruler, and other Unionists made concessions of Home Rule still more sweeping. The dream of the *via media* has vanished. There is no talk even of a scheme of local self government, and the rude awakening of the muddle-headed sentimentalists who wanted a compromise, is the massacre of Mitchelstown, the manufacture of outrage, as at Lisdoonvarna, and the suppression of the liberty of the press, as in the case of the

attack on the Lord Mayor of Dublin. This is not what your moderate and tender-hearted man wanted, and thus he washes his hands of Tory policy, and, perhaps with an accompanying sigh, says there is nothing for it but Mr. Gladstone and real Home Rule.

The events in Ireland itself have powerfully contributed to increase the reaction from the Tory policy. Things there have turned out better than the most sanguine could have hoped. The Irish nation stood between a Scylla and a Charybdis as menacing as ever threatened the fortunes of a nation. Tame submission would have been disastrous; an outbreak of crime would have been still more fatal. To steer so clearly that there could be no mistake as to the intensity, on the part of the people, of resistance to oppression, and, at the same time, that the holy cause should not be stained or prejudiced by cowardly and secret crime and outrage, was the task which the Irish people had to perform; and right well have they done it. Nothing, indeed, in the whole history of Ireland is fuller of encouragement to those who believe in the political capacity of the Irish race than this attitude since Mr. Gladstone proposed Home Rule. The truism has become more trite than ever during recent discussions that responsibility steadies men and nations. Already the steadying effect of responsibility has been visible to anyone who has been accustomed to see and keenly observe the Irish people. This demeanor, even at public meetings, is different from what it used to be. Despite the rich flow of hope that is in all their hearts, there is a visible absence of that unrestrained enthusiasm which used to be one of the main characteristics of Irish political gatherings. They cheer less frequently, they have almost ceased to interrupt, they are silent, self-restrained, almost stolid even when a favorite orator in a stirring oration is appealing to their ears and hearts. We speak now of Irish audiences in England. We hear of even still more remarkable signs of self-restraint among audiences in Ireland. Even from irresponsible lips there comes no cry that might embarrass the speaker, or prejudice the cause. This is, indeed, more significant than any number of discreet speeches on the part of individuals. A crowd is a thing which no amount of previous arrangement or drilling can wholly manufacture into any mood. The conduct of the Irish people at these gatherings must therefore come from individual impulse, and surely this is a marvellous instance of political sagacity that so many millions of people should be able, even in the moment of their highest hopes and at their most tumultous gatherings, to so correctly appreciate the situation and to so completely exercise that self-mastery which is the highest quality of political society.

One of the greatest dangers, therefore, which threatened the Irish Cause has been got rid of. The Irish people have been able to

exercise complete self-restraint. Their success in this regard has been made more remarkable, because it stands side by side with their success in avoiding another peril. The Irish people have been discreet; they have likewise been brave. No Irishman can read without a stirring in his blood of those scenes in which men and even women and girls have for hours resisted the bailiffs, the emergency men, the police and the soldiers, and have made, in nearly every cabin in Ireland threatened with eviction, a defence whose bravery and whose skill might well make a military engineer envious.

The effect of these fierce and brave fights has been excellent. There was a time when whole villages in Ireland could be swept away not only with the swiftness, but also with the deadly silence, of a plague. The cries of hundreds of men, women and children turned out on roadsides to die, or starve, or emigrate, never pierced for many generations any ears beyond those of their next door neighbor, or the priest that came to smooth the passage of many of the victims from eviction to death. In 1846 and 1847, the landlords raged with a ferocity almost as deadly as that of the famine and the fever; but the world regarded it all as the inevitable consummation of the rights of property. In any of these years a hundred thousand homes could be levelled, and the world know nothing and care nothing, beyond a short conversation in the House of Commons, a sigh and the confession that 'twere better that such things should not be kept from the Ministry, and the reproduction in the English newspapers of all policies of a stirring article from an Irish National journal, as a specimen of wild Irish rhetoric. And now there isn't a cabin so squalid in all Ireland, there isn't a poor creature, man or woman, old or young, so mean but the world knows and digests and rages over the story of their wrongs. Every eviction has been a drama which has had all mankind for an audience; and this it is that is breaking down the power of the landlord and the tyranny of the Government. Every man and woman, then, that has stood by the humble home bravely against eviction, has not only acted the manly part, but has fought for an Irish victory as truly and as effectively as if he or she rushed to the cannon's mouth under a green flag amid the swift rush of battle.

The publicity thus ensured for evictions has been the first great cause of the downfall of the Ministerial policy. The second great disaster was the Mitchelstown massacre. Our readers have doubtless already had an opportunity of examining the main evidence in this case. Never has there been a greater exhibition of want of courage, order and humanity. It exhibits the Government of Ireland as at once cruel and incapable. It is now clear that nobody

is willing to take the responsibility for having ordered the people to be shot down; that there was not the smallest necessity for the firing in defence of the barracks; that the persons killed were entirely innocent of offence; and that the whole massacre originated in an attempt on the part of the police to force their way through a meeting in a manner at once exasperating and illegal. No one can exaggerate the thrill of horror which passed through England on the receipt of this news. The English people have been accustomed for generations to the most absolute freedom in their public gatherings; and the one exception to this rule, where people peaceably demonstrating were shot down, namely, the Peterloo massacre, is still remembered and will be remembered to the end of English history.

The brutality of the police has been made the more clear by the fortunate fact that there were present at the Mitchelstown meeting a number of Englishmen who were able to tell the story to the House of Commons and to English audiences. Mr. Labouchere and Mr. Brunner have done Ireland enormous benefit by being able to describe, as eye-witnesses, the whole scene; and indeed the English visitors to Ireland must be counted as one of the most important factors in bringing about the present condition of the public mind. These visitors have at once instructed the English people and intimidated the Dublin Castle official and the evicting landlord.

We believe Mr. William O'Brien has expressed the opinion that if it had not been for the presence of Mr. Labouchere and Mr. Brunner, fifty or sixty people would have been shot at Mitchelstown instead of three. The most amusing stories are told of the obsequious servility which is shown towards the representatives of an English constituency or of a just English journal by some of those tyrannical agents, who in days gone by have mercilessly lashed every one of the helpless defendants. Already it was supposed—and it was intended by Mr. Balfour when he introduced his Coercion Act—that resistance to eviction should, if necessary, be put down in blood. Resistance to eviction has, however, gone on, and rather more fiercely, since the Coercion Act was passed, and not one life has yet been taken. The police have more than once been ordered to load their rifles and prepare for a volley, but the rifles—at least up to the moment at which we are writing—remain unfired. This, of course, is not to be attributed to any awakening of the spirit of humanity in the breasts of Mr. Balfour or his subordinates. It is the keen sense of the electioneerer. The absence of bloodshed marks the low cunning of the dare-devil, not the awakened conscience of the humanitarian. The eye of the Inspector of Police and of the evicting agent has quailed before the publicity, and the menace of Englishmen has brought home to them and Mr. Balfour that

another Mitchelstown would mean an outburst of popular rage in England that would sweep him and his policy from power. It is no exaggeration, then, to say that the sympathy of English Liberals has enormously aided the bravery of the Irish people in paralyzing the arm of coercion, and bringing over the Cromwellianism of Mr. Balfour to obsequious parleys with English negotiators and to miserable fiascos in the police courts.

A final disaster to the policy of coercion has been what is known as the Lisdoonvarna murder. It will be remembered that in a moonlighting raid on the house of a boycotted landgrabber, Head-Constable Whelehan was murdered. This was the one untoward event since the passage of Coercion. It might be the first symptom of that wild outburst of crime which would probably submerge Irish hopes in blood. The Irish members regarded the crime with a shudder and with a painful anticipation of what these fresh brutalities might evoke. The Liberal Unionists were not slow also to perceive the capital use to which this outrage could be put, and for a couple of weeks every one of their journals placed this murder in the forefront. Liberal Unionist politicians adopted the same policy at a meeting of an organization consisting of relatives and dependents which Mr. Chamberlain dignifies by the name of the Radical Union; and a special resolution was devoted to this great crime. Of course, there was much dishonesty in all this. Even if the murder were as atrocious as Unionists and Tories endeavored to make it appear, it was still but one murder, and one murder in a period of terrible excitement would contrast very favorably with other periods of excitement, not merely in Ireland, but in any other country. But still there was the crime, and there were the Unionists endeavoring to galvanize it into something like the semblance of life. There were the calumnies which even Ministerial statistics had refuted in the earlier part of the year—the calumny that Ireland, instead of being almost miraculously free from crime, was overrun with murder and outrage. It will be understood with what surprise, therefore, the revelation came upon the public that this murder was an outrage manufactured and almost paid for. One of the wretched menial race of informers was present at the raid which resulted in the death of Head Constable Whelehan. It seems to have been observed that he stood apart while the raid was going on, and was unarmed. For some days after the arrest of the alleged moonlighters there was a whisper that Callinan had turned informer. At first this was supposed simply to mean that one conspirator had proved more cowardly than his companions, and had determined to save his own neck by betraying others. But when Callinan came upon the witness stand it was proved that not only was he a police agent on this particular occasion, but that for six years

he had been in the regular employment of the police. The wretched creature made his miserable trade and the conduct of the Government that employed him still more conspicuous by the revelation he had to make as to his own odious life. There is scarcely a crime in the calendar to which he had not to plead guilty. He had deserted from the army, he had stolen, he had been convicted of drunkenness, of carrying arms in a proclaimed district, and of indecent assault. He had been sentenced to almost every form of imprisonment known to the law—from a week's detention for drunkenness to seven years' penal servitude for larceny. This drunken and wretched thief is a fair specimen of the kind of agents upon whom English rule in Ireland rests. More startling, however, than even his own odious biography was the story of his relations with the police. It was clear that he did not belong to the county of Clare, and that he had been brought there by the police. He confessed that he had received both money and drink from the police before the raid took place, and that the raid and the person to be attacked were actually told by him to the police before, and that when he and his party knocked at the door of Sexton, the land grabber, Callinan passed a secret sign which had been previously arranged with the police. The question has yet to be determined whether this murder plot owed not merely its revelation, but also its conception and manufacture, to the fertile brain of the police informer. In every case the police had him employed, he was *agent provocateur*, and the policeman whose life has been sacrificed is proved to have been an instrument in bringing about the encounter in which he died. The shock of this upon such a people as the English is peculiarly strong. Nothing has given them greater pride in the past than the contrast between their own institutions and the system of espionage on the Continent. They now find that their police adopt the worst methods of the Russian system, that the detectives of crime are partially, at least, its creators, that their rule in Ireland can find no better instrument than such a creature as Callinan. All these things have caused every decent Englishman to feel ashamed of English rule in Ireland, and have given thousands of men a disgust for the policy of coercion which perhaps even more striking and more important events could not produce.

The fiasco in the prosecution of the Lord Mayor of Dublin, though in itself apparently a small matter, has come to bring final discouragement to the Coercionist party. Governments are more discredited by incompetence than even by wickedness, and the last prosecution is an instance of gross incompetence. There is not a man in England that has not been laughing for the last two days over the miserable break-down of the Castle lawyers, and Mr. Bal-

four has been ordered peremptorily to curtail his vacation and to return to Dublin Castle. That gentleman is not accustomed to allow pressing matters of State to interfere with his elegant leisure. For the first time almost in the annals of Parliamentary life he has been absent from the House of Commons at question time, and has left the important work of answering questions on the administration of his office to a subordinate at once so incompetent and discredited as Colonel King-Harman. Whether the return of Mr. Balfour is to have such a beneficent effect upon the action of the officials of Dublin Castle as his backers in the press hope, is very open to doubt. Some people seem to think that he has come out of the trying ordeal of the present crisis with credit. That certainly is not our opinion. We have watched the gentleman for a great many years, and we think now as we have always thought, that he is one of the weakest and most incompetent men in the Tory party. His appearance is like his mind. His head is extremely small; he has long and very thin legs, which he stretches out ostentatiously, leaning the weight of his body on a neck as thin as a girl's, with a simper on his face that suggests the school miss; and he has the habit of seeking inspiration from a scented handkerchief, after the manner of the typical curate of the English burlesque stage. Prince Bismarck once remarked of his uncle, the Marquis of Salisbury, that he was a reed painted like iron, and one or two sensational journalists have discovered that Mr. Balfour is a lath that really is iron. This new legend is largely the creation of some Liberal journalists who desire to make a sensation by saying things that may be disagreeable to their own party, but it is only a legend. The only foundation for the new faith in Mr Balfour is that he has made some smart speeches, that he has been openly discourteous and factiously candid in his ignorance of Irish affairs. Some of his statements with regard to the Irish question might well be put in copybooks of the Irish National Schools of the future as examples of the depth of folly by which Ireland used to be ruled in old and forgotten days. His violence appears to us rather to represent feminine hysterics than manly self-confidence, and reminds us more of a *petroleuse* than a Bismarck. He breathes of slaughter in fantastic dreams. He imagines himself a Cromwell, because he happens to clench his teeth and tighten his delicate fingers, and he orders a fusilade between a giggle and a scream.

Mr. Balfour, then, may return to Dublin Castle, but the fight will still remain unequal, and this, of course, insures the entire breakdown of the Ministry. The Chief Secretary for Ireland and his Ministry have, after all, a short shift. The interval left to them is only that between the present date and the meeting of Parliament next February. In February Mr. Balfour must be able to point to

a subdued Ireland and a suppressed League, or he must "throw up the sponge." What prospect there is of the suppression of the League our readers will already have had abundant opportunities of judging. Every day the newspapers contain accounts of the meetings of branches that are supposed to be suppressed, and this will go on. The calculation of Mr. Balfour probably was that if he were only to strike hard enough, and to put in gaol a sufficient number of people, the rest of Ireland would be terrorized; and a hundred men sentenced to six months' imprisonment must mean the running away of the half-million of people who would form the membership of the National League. That has turned out to be a gross miscalculation. It is perfectly clear that if he is to break up the League by imprisonment, he can only do so by the imprisonment of almost every member of that body in every district which he proclaims. His prisoners must be counted, not by scores, nor even by hundreds, but by thousands; and he knows as well as anybody that the spectacle of even a thousand men in prison is more than the English people would stand or any Ministry could survive. Even at a time when the whole Liberal party was on the side of Mr. Gladstone, and the Tories were rejoicing at the splendid development of Tory policy set by a Liberal statesman, the arrest of a thousand men broke down coercion, drove Mr. Forster from political life, and but for the assassinations of the Phœnix Park would have brought Home Rule two or three years ago. How, then, is Mr. Balfour going to succeed, in case he resorts to wholesale imprisonment in the face of Mr. Gladstone, the most powerful of English leaders, nearly two hundred Liberal members, and a public opinion which is becoming daily more exasperated with that policy?

This leads us to a few words upon the manner in which the action of the Executive has been met by the members of the League. We have all along in these pages pointed out that the present movement is different from previous movements, in the fact that there is a union, for almost the first time in Irish politics, of all the forces of Irish National life, except the landlords and the Orangemen. We have indicated the enormous importance of the fact that the episcopate and the priesthood of Ireland, for almost the first time in Irish history, have stood to a man on the same side as the National party, and that throughout the country nearly all the Branches are under the presidency of the curate or the parish priest—and almost as often under the presidency of the parish priest as the curate. We think it necessary to add that, because, as is well known to those familiar with Irish life, there is often a difference between, if not the politics, at least the political spirit of the parish priest and his curate—a difference mainly accounted for by the difference in the age of the two. The parish priest as a rule represents the

more conservative, and the curate the more fiery section of the Nationalists in the ranks of the clergy; and the branches of the League, as we have said, are now largely under the leadership of a body so conservative and so potent as the parish priests. We have again and again pointed out—and the Government knew the fact better than any one else—that a contest with the united Catholic Church in Ireland is a more serious thing than a contest with any political party. We think we have in previous articles shown that the branches of the League are only the first line of defence, and that when they are broken down the chapels still remain; and that no Government would dare to really bombard this second line of defence. The real question, considering the probabilities of the struggle between the National League and the Government, we have always held to be, whether the priests and the people would continue to remain absolutely united. They have remained absolutely united. Throughout the whole of Ireland there is not the smallest sign of a difference between them. The meetings of the suppressed branches are presided over quite as frequently by the ecclesiastical as by the lay president, and it is clear that the priest is determined to pursue the same policy, run the same risk, and suffer the same sentence as the lay Nationalist. One can fancy the spectacle Ireland would present if Mr. Balfour were to proceed with his crusade of sham Cromwellianism, and bring before the courts every priest who has presided over the meeting of a suppressed branch of the League. Of course such a thing is not within the range of political possibility. Ireland would not stand it—England would not stand it,—for the faith in Mr. Gladstone's policy has slowly broken down the old partitions of religious bigotry, and the civilized world would stand aghast at the spectacle.

The second point, which we have always held would decide the struggle between the Government and the National League, would be, whether a sufficient number of men were willing to go to prison in the defence of their political opinions. There is now not the slightest doubt about it. Indeed, there never was any doubt among those who had an opportunity of judging the temper of the Irish people during the last six months. No one, of course, looks forward with a feeling of pleasure to the prospect of six months' imprisonment, with all its hardships, its horrors of prison dress and insufficient food and solitary confinement, which Mr. Balfour declares it is his intention to extend to political as well as ordinary prisoners. But the Irish people have recognized the importance of the struggle and the necessity for sacrifice, and wherever the question has been put, the universal answer has been that six months' imprisonment has no terrors for the people. Indeed, the remarkable thing about the whole business, one reason why we all feel assured as to the result, is the spirit of cheery

confidence among the Irish people themselves. The feeling towards Mr. Balfour himself is one rather of strong contempt than of fierce resentment. An English orator was abusing him very strongly the other day in a remote district of Achill, when a peasant from the crowd cried out: "Don't mind him, sir; he's like the madman's curse." This indication of the temper of the people is most important. In political as in other battles, much depends upon the *morale* of the troops, and whether they go into the struggle with a feeling that they will come out victorious. In entering on the struggle with Mr. Balfour, the people have perfect confidence in ultimate victory, and victory will, in all probability, very soon justify this confidence.

It is clear, then, that if, when Parliament meets, the suppressed branches of the League still continue to meet; if the great organization, instead of being entirely overpowered, is still more potent than ever; if, from the different jails of Ireland there issue voices of defiance against the Government, and if thousands of men show their readiness to take the place of those who have gone before them—if this is the state of things when Parliament meets, it is plain that Mr. Balfour must acknowledge his defeat.

How far this will affect the Parliamentary situation it is not easy yet to forecast. One disagreeable feature in the future is, that the more clearly the voice of the English constituencies is against the policy of the Government, the more certainly will the Liberal Unionists back up the Government. A general election, whatever the results it will have, must mean the extinction of the Liberal Unionists as a party. There is every reason, therefore, from this point of view, to postpone as long as possible the appeal to the constituencies, as that appeal must mean their own political death. On the other hand, if the voice of the country be so loud as to leave no doubt of what the future verdict will be, the Liberal Unionists will begin to break up, and there will come to Mr. Gladstone a certain number of those who are determined to remain in political life, and to remain in it not as Tories, but as Liberals.

The first day that fifteen or twenty Unionists turn against the Ministry, it will mean the dissolution of the Ministry. A fierce policy like the present requires a strong government, a government with large majorities. The secession of fifteen or twenty Unionists would so bring down the Government that it would only have small majorities; and a government with small majorities would be unequal to the gigantic task of governing Ireland by force. When such a state of things comes about the Government will stand between two alternatives—either they will have to give way to Mr. Gladstone or they will have to appeal to the country for a united and stronger party. Either course would mean the almost immediate passing of Home Rule. No sane politician has the least doubt that an appeal

would now give Mr. Gladstone a great majority. If the Tory party resigned and left him at the mercy of the Unionists, there is little doubt that he at the first moment would also bring the great question before the high tribunal of the people.

These, then, are the facts and the situation at the present hour, and there is not one of them that does not portend a great and at the same time a speedy victory for the cause of Home Rule. The Liberal Unionists seem to feel this. One has only to look at their prints to observe the perceptible difference in their tone at the present hour and their tone a short time back. The *Times*, which has been the most unscrupulous and the most braggart in its attacks upon Home Rule, has already begun to speak in a minor key. A few days ago it piteously exclaimed that "nations like individuals sometimes went mad;" the madness of the *Times* being, of course, the giving of Home Rule to Ireland.

Among the ablest opponents of the Irish cause have been Mr. Edward and Mr. Albert Dicey. Mr. Edward Dicey is the editor of the *Observer*, an important Sunday newspaper, which has been a most effective enemy of Home Rule. Mr. Albert Dicey, his brother, is the author of the best work upon the English Constitution, and also of a most able book against Home Rule. Both brothers have contributed to recently published monthlies, and each is equally loud in his lamentations over the decay of Ministerial *prestige*. When one turns from these counsels of despair to the Liberal party, an entirely different spectacle is seen. Never has there been greater activity or greater hopefulness in the ranks of that body. The hopefulness of the Liberal Party will best be seen by the contrast between its present position and its position on previous occasions after a great defeat. When, in 1874, Mr. Gladstone was driven from office by an overwhelming majority, it took him six years to overthrow the Tory Ministry, and four or five years of incessant effort, and constant propagandism and huge gatherings from one end of England to the other, before he could shake the Tory Ministry, or win a single by-election. In the same way the Tories were for several years unable to shake the Ministry of Mr. Gladstone after their defeat in 1880. We are now separated from the apparently overwhelming disaster of 1886 by about fifteen months, and already the Liberal Party is restored to its hopefulness of spirit and is more active than it was even before its defeat. Great, enthusiastic and unanimous meetings of Liberals are taking place in all parts of the country. Even districts where the Tory Party have enjoyed undisturbed possession from time immemorial are waking up and falling under the Liberal influence. In the midst of this din of battle, the Tories as a rule observe a melancholy silence. In short, the battle of Home Rule will be decided before many months have passed from the appearance of these pages.

Scientific Chronicle.

MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION.

During the week ending August 6th, the American Association for the Advancement of Science met at Columbia College, New York. The promoters of the Association may well be gratified by the great interest in its work manifested by scientists and the public throughout the session. The success of the meeting in New York goes to confirm the assertion made two years ago, that the Association can have successful reunions only in the great centres of intellectual activity. The meeting was more numerously attended than any of the thirty-five previously held, with the exception of the one of 1884, held in Philadelphia, when the attendance of many members of the British Association and the interest taken in the International Electrical Exhibition helped largely to swell the number. The average worth of the two hundred and fifty papers read at the recent meeting also compares favorably with former years.

The usual addresses in the general session and the various sections, do not call for particular comment. We cannot, however, pass unnoticed that of the retiring President on the subject of Darwinism. The address was a great surprise, but we cannot criticise it in detail, having tried in vain to obtain its text. We were not prepared to find in a scientific paper such modes of demonstration as the Professor uses. We were astonished at his boldness and assurance in advancing statements, which, even from a Darwinian point of view, could not be substantiated; and, doubtless, even his scientific associates thought it at least questionable taste for him to go out of his way to attack the Church with the old calumnies so often refuted. The lack of accuracy in many of his statements tended to mar the credit of the Association and to bring its work into disrepute with many intelligent men. It may be on this account that the address was ignored in the reports of some scientific papers, ordinarily very ready to disseminate views favorable to the Darwinian theory.

A reference to some of the papers will furnish most of the items of this issue's Chronicle. Of the others, some were of too technical a character, and some, again, not sufficiently interesting to our readers to treat of in these pages.

Mr. W. O. Attwater's paper on "Physiological and Pecuniary Economy of Food" was clear, entertaining and instructive. A lengthy discussion, in which many distinguished persons participated, followed the reading of the paper, and gave ample testimony of the interest attached to the subject.

Another paper attracting general attention was that of Mr. Lucien

Howe on the "Increase of Blindness in the United States." From this gentleman's figures it would appear that, while the population increases 30 per cent., the number of persons afflicted with blindness increases 140 per cent.

In the section of Physics, a great many interesting subjects were very ably treated. The paper on a "Method for Making the Wave Length of Sodium Light the Practical Standard of Length," for which we are indebted to Drs. Michelson and Morley, excited the most flattering attention, and in the discussion that followed elicited many expressions of approval and praise. Another paper by the same gentlemen, on the "Relative Velocity of the Earth and the Luminiferous Ether," was scarcely less favorably received.

EDISON'S "PYROMAGNETIC GENERATOR."

Mr. Edison's paper, read by Professor Barker, of Pennsylvania University, was an item which will make memorable the meeting of 1887. It gave an account of the new discovery in the direction of generating electrical energy cheaply and abundantly. The discovery seems to be one of the most important of recent years, and Professor Barker declared in a private conversation that it is probably destined to revolutionize mechanical appliances and industries.

In the generators at present in use the energy accumulated in coal is transformed into motion, which is imparted to suitable apparatus and converted into electricity. For a long time scientists have been endeavoring to transform calorific energy directly into electricity. Mr. Farmer, indeed, and others had succeeded by thermo-dynamical appliances in developing electricity directly from calorific energy, but only to the extent of converting 1 per cent. of the energy latent in coal. An economical method was still to be found. Mr. Edison has shown keener vision in the search, and his is the honor of discovering and developing the plan. His invention is not the outcome of some newly discovered principle. It is the development of facts long and familiarly known. These facts may be briefly and simply stated as follows:

1. When magnetic substances gain or lose magnetism within a coil of insulated wire, currents of electricity are induced in the wire.

2. Iron, nickel, cobalt, chromium, etc., are demagnetized on being raised to a certain temperature, and, if within the field of a permanent magnet, resume their magnetism on being sufficiently cooled.

Let an electro-magnet, consisting of a hollow core of iron surrounded by insulated copper wire, be placed between the poles of a powerful horse-shoe magnet. Permit a current of highly heated air to pass through this hollow core and a current of cold air to succeed the heated one. When the heated air passes through, the iron loses its magnetism, and a direct current of electricity is induced in the wire. Then the current of cold air reduces the temperature of the heated iron, and it again

becomes a magnet, inducing a reverse current of electricity in the surrounding wire. These two currents can be utilized as alternate currents, or, if a continuous one is desired, they can be "straightened" by means of a commutator. In Mr. Edison's new generator, there are six or more electro-magnets with hollow cores, of very thin iron. These are fixed vertically between the poles of a horse-shoe magnet, and are attached to two metallic disks at either end. They should be arranged so as to be equally distant from a common centre and from each other. Through the disks passes a hollow shaft, carrying a semicircular plate of fire-clay below the electro-magnets. The whole system thus arranged is placed over a furnace fed by a blast. The fire-clay plate shuts off the heated air of the furnace from one-half of the iron cores, giving it free access to the others. The heated air raises the thin iron cores through which it passes to a temperature at which their magnetism ceases. Thus a direct current of electricity is induced in the bobbins surrounding them. The cores covered by the plate are not heated, and, therefore, retain their magnetism. On revolving the plate, however, these one by one are exposed to the flame, and the action just described again takes place. On the other hand, those previously exposed are now shielded by the guard-plate, and are cooled off rapidly by the cold-air blast, which, on its way to feed the furnace, is forced through them. Being thus reduced to a temperature sufficiently low, they again become magnets, and accordingly induce reverse currents of electricity in their respective bobbins. So the action continues, and a constant supply of electricity is furnished. On the revolving shaft is arranged a commutator very similar in principle to the one of Gramme's machine. This commutator affords the means of "straightening" the alternate currents.

This pyromagnetic generator is still, no doubt, in a rudimentary stage; but there seems to be every indication that it will furnish electricity for practical purposes at much smaller expense than the generators now in use.

FOG SIGNALS AND THE TELEPHONE.

"A Method of Telephonic Communication Between Ships at Sea" was the subject of a paper read by Professor L. E. Blake, Terre Haute, Ind. The many disastrous collisions at sea during the prevalence of fogs, and the appalling loss of human life in consequence, have stimulated scientists to a renewed energy in the endeavor to find some means by which these fatal mishaps may be prevented, either entirely or in part.

Experience has shown that the ordinary fog-horn is not sufficiently reliable. The signal is often heard too late to avoid disaster and death, and hence another mode of signalling, both more speedy and reliable, is imperatively needed.

We dare express our belief that the *method* treated of in Mr. Blake's paper possesses both the required conditions, and that, too, in a marked

degree. The Professor suggests that the signal be transmitted through the water, which may be accomplished by supplying vessels with a bell or whistle so arranged as to produce sound under water. Furthermore, every ship should have a telephone plunged to a sufficient depth in the sea, and connected with a receiver on board, so that signals from approaching vessels may be communicated to officers in charge.

Sound in water travels five times faster than in air, and supposing the telephone to be below the disturbed portion of the water, the sounds will be regularly and distinctly communicated. Moreover, the sounds from the bells or whistles might be regulated to a certain peculiar pitch, so as to be easily distinguishable from other sounds heard at the same time.

Lighthouses, lightships, headlands, etc., might also be provided with submerged bells, differing in pitch from one another as well as from those on ships. A system of detailed communication could easily be established by an arrangement of short and prolonged sounds with intervening pauses, as in the Morse alphabet.

INTEROCEANIC CANAL.

On Monday, the 15th, before the joint meeting of the sections of Mechanical and Economic Science, several interesting papers were read on this subject. Each of these papers was seemingly directed to show the marked preference of its author for the route through Nicaragua. Commander Taylor opened the discussion. "Many routes," he said, "have been examined across the Isthmus. . . . Of these only three have been gravely considered, a sea-level canal at Panama, a lock canal at Nicaragua and a ship railway at Tehuantepec. . . . The Panama Canal has been demonstrated a hopeless failure." He then gave some figures to confirm this statement. These words recall to our mind the language employed for years by the English, when the Suez Canal was in process of construction. Frequently men, considered competent to judge, declared it a failure and an impossibility. Yet, it is the English who have derived from it the greatest benefit. It cannot be denied that many and great technical difficulties must be overcome to complete the Panama Canal. Moreover, from a financial standpoint, it must be conceded that the estimated cost of construction has proved to be entirely inadequate. But it still remains true that, as the English exaggerated the difficulties hindering the completion of the Suez, so on this side of the ocean have many acted in regard to the Panama project, simply because it is not an American enterprise. It was not without reason that the *British Trade Journal* recently remarked, concerning the Panama route, that the Americans "would be willing to buy the whole concern" and finish it, if they could get the work, as it stands, at a reduced price.

Commander Taylor added: "The ship railway at Tehuantepec prom-

ises to be as disastrous a failure as the Panama Canal." Here he comes in contradiction with many ardent defenders of the novel project of the late Captain Eads, whose authority in engineering was second to none, and whose success in several difficult undertakings is known to all. Did time and space permit us, we could easily give satisfactory answers to many of the objections urged against the plan proposed by Captain Eads. This, at least, must be conceded, that, if the interests of the United States alone were to be consulted, the ship railway would be preferable to either of the canals, because it would furnish the shortest route between the great harbors of the Atlantic and those of the Pacific. But, however great this advantage may be for the United States, it should not decide the choice of the route, because the success of canal as well as of railway will depend upon the traffic of many nations. From this point of view the Nicaragua Canal is preferable to the ship railway, while the Panama Canal is better than either of the other two. For it is nearer to all the Pacific ports of South America, and to the ports of Australia and the surrounding islands. Besides, it is the only route free from the delays which are occasioned by locks and the raising of ships, granting the latter to be possible.

It is worth our while to employ here the experience afforded us by the Suez Canal. At present, this canal is almost insufficient, to such an extent has the traffic increased. In consequence of this, those in charge are seriously considering the utility either of enlarging it or of constructing another parallel to it. What would be the result, if the ships had to be raised above and lowered to sea-level, whether the means employed were the old-fashioned way of locks or the novel plan of Captain Eads? In the face of this experience would it be judicious to select any route across the Isthmus which would soon prove to be inadequate?

But let us return to the papers on the Nicaragua Canal. After the general questions had been set forth by Commander Taylor, a more technical and detailed paper was read by Engineer R. E. Perry, United States Navy. This gentleman was the principal assistant of Chief Engineer Monocal, United States Navy (who was absent from the convention on account of sickness), when the survey of the Nicaragua route was taken in 1885 by order of our Government. It would be too long to consider the many details and figures given in this paper. Allusion was made to the delays occasioned by locks, but the objection arising therefrom was by no means completely answered. The advantages of the route were set forth at great length. Some of these are incontestable. Others were viewed in a light perhaps too favorable. It appears from this paper that the distance from the Atlantic to the Pacific by the Nicaragua route is 169 miles. Of this distance the actual canal occupies 40 miles. The remainder is free navigation through Lake Nicaragua and the Rio San Juan. The lake would be entered at a height of 110 feet above sea-level. It is deep, and would furnish a great and safe harbor. The estimated expense is $65,000,000, and the time for construction six years. Surgeon J. F. Bransford, United States Navy, fol-

lowed with a paper on "Climatic and Sanitary Notes" of the route. He showed its great and undeniable superiority under this aspect over the Panama Canal, where so many lives have already been sacrificed. This paper concluded the discussion which was, on the whole, very interesting.

IMPROVED METHOD OF METALLURGY FOR SODIUM AND POTASSIUM.

When we spoke, during the past year, of the great progress made in the metallurgy of aluminium, especially with regard to the cheapness of its production, we alluded to the new method devised by Mr. H. Y. Castner for the manufacture of sodium. This latter metal is extensively used in the preparation of aluminium, and up to the introduction of Mr. Castner's process was very costly. As the details of the new method were then kept secret, we could not do more than mention the fact; but now that the process is made public and has been for months in successful operation, it may be of interest again to say a few words about it, the more so as the cheap production of sodium and potassium will be appreciated, not only in the manufacture of aluminium, but also in many other industries.

The method heretofore in use for the preparation of sodium and potassium consists in distilling, at a very high temperature, a mixture of the sodium carbonate and carbon, in the form of charcoal or small coal, technically termed slack. A small amount of chalk or lime is added, chiefly with a view to render the mixture less fusible, thereby preventing the two substances from separating by reason of their different specific weights. The carefully mixed and previously calcined mass is packed in wrought-iron cylinders fifteen centimeters in diameter and heated almost to the melting point of iron. Under the influence of the heat carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide are given off and a double oxide of calcium and sodium is formed. As the temperature rises this is decomposed in presence of the excess of carbon, and the sodium (or potassium) set free is volatilized and passes into the condenser.

Even when the greatest care is taken the yield is only one-third the theoretical amount of the metal contained in the charge. The consumption of fuel is comparatively great, and the constant renewal of the wrought-iron cylinders increases much the costliness of the process, representing about one-half the expense of the reduction.

Mr. Castner's modification consists in doing away with the addition of the lime and using instead of the carbon a sort of iron carbide, having the same specific weight as the sodic carbonate when fused. Since the two substances have the same weight, the fusion of the carbonate does not prevent intimate contact; therefore less of the reducing agent is necessary, larger crucibles, and consequently larger charges, may be employed, and the operation may be perfected at a much lower temperature than is possible in the old process. The reducing agent is

prepared by calcining a mixture of tar and finely divided iron, and the resulting heavy metallic coke, containing about 70 per cent. iron and 30 per cent. carbon, is pulverized.

The mixture of the alkali carbonate and the iron carbide is put in large cast-iron crucibles fitted with lids and communicating by means of tubes with the condenser.

The fuel is ordinary illuminating gas and hot air, sufficient heat being evolved to raise the temperature to about 1000 degrees.

The materials need not be as carefully mixed as in the old process, and the preliminary calcination may be omitted. The cast-iron crucibles last much longer than the wrought-iron ones formerly used, and the yield of metal is much higher, amounting to 90 per cent. This advance over the former yield is to be attributed to the extremely close contact of the materials, and also to the fact that the gaseous product (carbon di-oxide, carbon monoxide and hydrogen) has very little chemical action on the sodium vapor, while in presence of excess of carbon many compounds are formed from which the metal is with difficulty separable.

The iron remaining in the crucible after the operation is washed with hot water to free it from traces of sodic carbonate, then pulverized, dried, mixed with tar, and again transformed into carbide for another operation.

ALVAN CLARK AND THE GREAT LICK TELESCOPE.

The death, at the ripe age of eighty-three, of Mr. Alvan Clark, the most eminent and most successful manufacturer of telescopic lenses, calls fresh attention to his remarkable career. Whatever progress lens-making has recently made may be said to be identified with Mr. Clark's life, and to have culminated in his last successful work—the great thirty-six inch lens for the telescope of the new Lick Observatory.

For many years Alvan Clark lived in Boston, pursuing the life of an artist; nor did he begin telescope-making until his elder son was old enough to be his co-laborer. As he himself said, "I began to study mechanics and astronomy in order to instruct my boy." His first work in the new line was to make a reflecting telescope. He then turned his attention to the manufacture of lenses, beginning with smaller ones. Each successful lens drew him on to try his skill at one of a larger size. In 1853 the first small lenses of his make were sent abroad, and immediately his reputation was assured. Up to 1860 the largest lenses in the world never exceeded fifteen inches diameter. But at this date he succeeded in filling an order for one of eighteen inches, by the aid of which his elder son, Alvan G. Clark, discovered the Sirius Companion, and received, in recognition, a gold medal from the French Academy.

Ten years later Alvan Clark accepted the contract for the twenty-six inch lens of the American Naval Observatory. It was mounted in 1873. About this time Mr. James Lick, in a trust-deed, imposed upon his heirs the obligation of erecting "a powerful telescope, superior to and more

powerful than any yet made." When these directions were penned the largest telescopes in existence were that of the Naval Observatory just mentioned and Lord Rosse's six-foot reflector at Parsonstown, Ireland. It was considered at this time that the twenty-six inch lens had touched the limit. But a little later, Grubb, an Englishman, constructed a twenty-seven-inch refractor for the Vienna Imperial Observatory; whilst Mr. Clark surpassed himself by making a splendid thirty-inch glass for the Imperial Observatory at Pulkowa, Russia. Both of these feats were accomplished while the board of Lick trustees were preparing to let a contract for a telescope superior to anything thus far perfected. After hesitating between choosing a refractor with an aperture of more than thirty inches diameter, and a reflector exceeding seventy-two inches diameter, they at length resolved upon the former. Accordingly they made, January, 1881, a fifty-thousand-dollar contract with Alvan Clark & Sons for the manufacture of "an achromatic astronomical object-glass of thirty-six inches clear aperture," this size being the largest the firm would venture to contract for. The disk of flint-glass was cast by Feil & Son, Paris, in 1882, when it was at once put in the hands of Alvan Clark. Towards the close of the same year its companion, the crown-glass disk, was ready for shipment; but so brittle was the material that it cracked in packing. Great difficulties attended the casting of this crown-glass lens. Indeed, previous to this contract, no glass of the dimensions required had ever been cast. The Feils attempted the task, and cast thirty or more blocks before they obtained anything at all satisfactory; their failures now figure as curiosities along their factory walls. At length the elder Feil did succeed in the task; the good news was at once made known (September, 1885), and the lens shipped to Alvan Clark. This lens has been recently tested, and has given such satisfaction that it may be looked upon as the crowning triumph of Mr. Clark's life. We may add that the extra lens to be employed, in connection with the achromatic lens for astronomical photography, is yet to be made. It was nearly completed with the other, but was unfortunately destroyed during an experiment.

The powers of the eye-pieces prepared by the Clarks for the Lick Telescope are not known to us in detail. But to give an idea of the advantages afforded by it, we may add the following data deduced from theoretical considerations. The highest magnifying power giving good definition which can be used with the thirty-six inch lens is 2000. To one using this instrument, the moon would appear but one hundred and twenty miles distant, and on a clear night with a steady atmosphere objects on it one hundred feet or more in diameter would be distinctly seen. A higher power would bring the moon still nearer, and, though there would be some loss in distinctness, still smaller objects would be perceived.

While Mr. Clark proved himself to be a master optician he also figured as a general scientist. To him are due several discoveries, among which may be mentioned a very valuable and accurate method of measuring small celestial arcs.

Book Notices.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By *George Parke Fisher, D.D., L.L.D.*, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University. With maps. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1887.

In this work Dr. Fisher presents the historical movement of Christianity under five heads: Missions, Church Polity, Christian Doctrine, Christian Life, Christian Worship. Chronologically, he divides Church history into ancient, mediæval and modern.

The ancient era comprises the history of Christianity in the Græco-Roman world, prior to the fall of the Western Roman Empire, and during the migrations and conquests of the Germanic tribes. It terminates at the reconstitution of the Empire of the West under Charlemagne.

The mediæval era extends from Charlemagne to Luther and "The Protestant Reformation" at the opening of the sixteenth century.

Then commenced the modern era, extending down to the present time.

Each of these principal eras Dr. Fisher divides into distinct sections or periods. The first subordinate period covers the interval between the founding of the Church and the end of the Apostolic age or the close of the first century. The next period extends from the close of that century to the edict of toleration issued by Constantine in 312. During this period "we find," says Dr. Fisher, "that the Church has drawn apart from heretical parties and has formed a more compact organization under the Episcopate." The interval from about 300 to 600, or from Constantine to Pope Gregory I., constitutes another period during which Christianity, as professed by the Church and as defined through Councils, presents itself as the acknowledged faith of the Roman Empire, East and West. In the next two centuries, or from Gregory I. to Charlemagne, "the Gospel is received by the Teutonic nations over whom the sway of the Church is established." In the next three centuries "the sway of the Papacy is more and more built up in Western Europe." They bring us to "the advanced assertions of Pontifical authority" in the age of Gregory VII., who "ushers in the flourishing era of papal domination, which continues to the end of the thirteenth century or the reign of Boniface VIII., when its prestige and authority began to wane. Then two centuries elapsed before the Protestant revolt began, centuries during which the forces that produced that revolt were slowly gathering." This brings us down to the beginning of the sixteenth century. "The age of the Reformation" was attended and followed by "contests, both doctrinal and political, down to the Peace of Westphalia," in 1648. "At about this date may be placed the dawn of the recent period."

"This last period," says Dr. Fisher, and in this we agree with him, "is characterized by a new spirit in philosophy and culture, by discussions consequent on the spread of scientific investigation, by debates on the foundation of natural and revealed religion. With regard to the further characteristics he imputes to it, there is good reason for disputing Dr. Fisher's statement, unless he means to confine it to non-Catholics. The characteristics he mentions are "the growth of Christian philanthrophy, the progress of political and social reform, and the fresh

awakening of missionary effort." All these have characterized the Catholic Church from the days of the Apostles onwards, sometimes more visibly, sometimes, owing to supervening difficulties, less visibly; yet always and in every age have they formed important essential parts of the work she ever has striven to do.

But this is aside from our immediate line of thought. Our immediate purpose was to state the plan of Dr. Fisher's history, not to criticise it.

The outlines of this plan, as we have briefly sketched it, he has filled up with rare ability, and, as he says in his modest preface, and as we believe, he has tried to do it with "an honest desire to avoid all unfairness." As regards this, the difference between him and many other Protestant historical writers is very marked. Yet, at the same time, we are not sure that Dr. Fisher's honesty of purpose will not make his work all the more misleading, owing to the fundamentally erroneous ideas he entertains on a number of important subjects.

Without pretending to an intimate knowledge of Dr. Fisher's theological opinions or his relation to the various schools of New England thought, we gather enough from the work before us to convince us that his theory of the Church, of its mission, and of how it was to accomplish its mission, is essentially defective and erroneous. For him, evidently, the Church is not the Body of Christ, is not the Pillar and Ground of the everlasting, unchangeable truth, its authoritative teacher and interpreter. The Church is simply the form or forms which Christian ideas or Christian societies take to themselves for the purpose of self-existence, self-defence, and growth. So far, too, as we can discover from the volume before us, the character of these forms and the changes that, in his opinion, they underwent, were as purely the result of natural causes and human motives as the changes that have taken place in civil and political institutions. We do not affirm that this is Dr. Fisher's belief, but this is the impression which we gather from what he says about Church polity and Church organization.

We are under the impression that Dr. Fisher believes that the Church was divinely founded and was invested with certain divinely given functions, prerogatives, powers. But we fail to discover clear evidences of this belief in the volume before us. He seems intentionally to keep it in the background, and to aim at exhibiting the changes wrought by Christianity in the world as the result simply of the action of human forces aroused and guided by clearer knowledge of "the truths of the Gospel."

Hence Dr. Fisher seemingly attaches no more importance to the testimony of Sts. Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, Irenæus, Cyprian, and others who were personal disciples of the Apostles or of those who immediately succeeded them than he does to the speculations of Alexander Campbell or Emanuel Swedenborg. As for miracles, even those wrought by our Divine Lord and His Apostles, he barely alludes to them. As for subsequent miracles, however incontestably proved, he is as skeptical as Hume or Gibbon. He does not sneer at them, he systematically ignores them. No one would know from reading his history that St. John, the Apostle and Evangelist, was miraculously saved from death, or that God, time and again, has manifestly and miraculously interposed in answer to the prayers of His saints. As for mediæval miracles, "the minds of rude multitudes were attracted by the sight of wonder-working relics. . . . ." Even missionaries, like Boniface and Ansgar, although disclaiming supernatural gifts for themselves, believed that others possessed them. ". . . In the devotional system of the Middle Ages the celestial hierarchy had an important place. . . . The potent

reliance of the timid, tempted, persecuted soul was in the help and intercession of the saints. . . . More and more the legends of the saints were read. . . . These legends fill the sixty volumes of the yet unfinished collection of the Bollandists. . . .'' Respecting the *stigmata* of St. Francis, he says: "There is no room for the suspicion of deceit. The idea of a strange, abnormal, mental state is more plausible."

We acquit Dr. Fisher of intentional unfairness, but it is impossible to acquit him of frequent unintentional unfairness. Some instances of this are so glaring that it would be marvellous for him to be unconscious of it, were it not for the well-known power of personal bias and prepossession to becloud even the clearest intellect. We cite at random a few instances of this, some of them utter perversions of historic truth.

Referring to the turning-back of Attila and his host by Pope Leo the Great, from capturing and destroying Rome, Dr. Fisher says: "Their fury was not checked until the great Bishop of Rome and the imperial ambassadors, . . . *by gold and persuasion*, turned them back." St. Thomas of Canterbury, in his conflict with Henry II., is characterized as having "withstood every measure of reform that touched the interests of the Church." The flagitious lives, the crimes, the tyranny of Frederick Barbarossa, of Henry IV. of Germany, of Philip II. of France, of Henry VIII., and of Elizabeth of England, are lightly passed over, and placed in the background. Even the execution of Sir Thomas More is but faintly condemned, while that of Mary, Queen of Scots, is referred to as justified by proof of her connivance with a conspiracy to assassinate Elizabeth. As for Mary, Queen of England, and Elizabeth's predecessor, she was "bloody" Mary. The Albigenses, Dr. Fisher acknowledges, were tainted with Manichæan errors, yet he claims for them, in the face of opposing testimony, purity of life, and omits all reference to the fact that their principles were anarchical, and destructive of all social order. So, too, as regards the Lollards in England and the Hussites in Bohemia. His references to Luther and Calvin and Knox, and other "Reformers," are, in like manner, remarkable for suppressions of notoriously discreditable facts.

In like manner, we might complain of the entirely incorrect and misleading statements of Dr. Fisher with regard to the promulgation by Pius IX. of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and of the definition and promulgation of the Infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff of the Church. So, too, might we complain of his meagre account of Catholics, of what they have done, and what they have suffered at the hands of Protestants in this country. But we can scarcely expect that Dr. Fisher, from his point of view, and with his life-long prepossessions, would or could do justice to these subjects.

Taking his book, as a whole, and looking at it simply as a literary work, it is a model, as regards judicious, orderly arrangement of topics, clearness of statement and style, condensation of matter, and consecutiveness of narration. It is infinitely superior, too, to any Church History, written by a non-Catholic, that we know of, in its statements and explanations of Catholic doctrines and practices, and of heretical deviations from them, and in its treatment of the relation of the Church in ancient and mediæval times to the promotion of learning, morality, charity, and, in a word, to civilization.

To Protestants, we mean to Protestants in the historical, proper sense of the word, the work will be unwelcome; for the acknowledgments it contains, if followed out consistently to their logical consequences, would disprove the fundamental contention of the "Reformers," and convict the whole "Reformation" movement of being an unnecessary,

unjustifiable schism, based upon self-will and obstinate self-opinion, ambition, hatred, and other unworthy motives. They would prove that all the reforms that were legitimately desirable or needed, could better be made within the Church, and that the so-called "Reformation" was a needless revolt against authority and a movement promotive of lawlessness and confusion, as regards ecclesiastical, civil and social relations.

But, plain as this is to Catholics, we doubt that non-Catholics will perceive it. Those of them who read Dr. Fisher's work thoughtfully, but with the bias of their present opinions, will have their prejudices against Catholics softened, but will also be confirmed in what is now the prevalent error of our times—the belief that "one religion is as good as another."

THE NEW PROCEDURE IN CRIMINAL AND DISCIPLINARY CAUSES OF ECCLESIASTICS IN THE UNITED STATES; or, A Clear and Full Explanation of the Instruction "Cum Magnopere," issued by the S. Congr. de Prop. Fide, in 1884, for the United States. By *Rev. S. B. Smith, D.D.*, Professor of Canon Law, Author of "Notes," "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law," "Counter Points," etc. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1887.

In this latest volume of Dr. Smith's, we have a work of great practical usefulness. It is an exposition of the *Instruction*, "Cum Magnopere," which was issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda as a law for the Church in the United States. But to say only this of the work, would do it injustice. For the *Instruction* itself, like most laws, merely outlines the main features of the procedure which it prescribes, and presupposes a full and accurate knowledge of the Canon Law bearing on the subject. Accordingly, Dr. Smith has endeavored, as he tells us in his preface, to fill up this outline. He explains the consecutive order in which the different stages of the trial follow upon each other, and the connection of each article or part with the whole *Instruction*. He also interweaves with his exposition such explanations of the principles of Canon Law as are necessary to an easy and clear understanding of the *Instruction* by those who are not acquainted with its principles.

Until very recently, the Church in the United States had, practically, no Canon Law. Outside of the meagre and necessarily inadequate legislation of Plenary and Provincial Councils, the government of the American Church has been in the hands of its bishops, with few or no limitations or restrictions. True, the government of the Church has been in their hands from the beginning, for they are the divinely appointed rulers of God's kingdom on earth; yet not in the manner and sense as was the case in the Church in the United States. In other countries authority, especially as regards matters of discipline, has been exercised according to law. With us ecclesiastical rulers have been practically a law unto themselves. This plainly was unsatisfactory. In the nature of things, it opened the way for complaints respecting the manner in which discipline was exercised, for disaffection and for contempt of authority.

Man is human, be he ecclesiastical or secular; and unrestricted, irresponsible power is calculated to do him harm. When possessed of it, he is liable, unconsciously almost to himself, to become proud and dictatorial. That the Church in the United States has suffered so little in this way, is reason for congratulation. It is, moreover, a splendid testimony to the noble Christian character of the American Episcopacy. We do not claim that there has been no dissatisfaction; that, from arbitrary exercise of episcopal power scandals have not at times arisen,

for history records such. But, taking it all in all, we cannot help thinking and saying that God has specially watched over the selection of rulers of His young Church in this country, and has jealously guarded against the exercise of tyranny. Plainly, had it not been for this, her history would have been less glorious, and the conquests of her faith less extensive and less firmly established.

In the "*Instruction*," "Cum Magnopere," we have the beginning of a new and better order of things. The old possibility of unjust exercise of power and of consequent contempt for authority no longer exists. For all practical purposes we now have a Canon Law for the Church of this country. The main features of the "*Instruction*" were discussed at the conferences held in Rome between the Cardinals of the Propaganda and the American Archbishops, toward the close of 1883. After these conferences it was promulgated as a law of the Holy See, and sent to the *Third Plenary Council of Baltimore*, held in 1884. It is now obligatory all over the United States, except in a few dioceses where, by Papal dispensation, the "*Instruction*" of 1878 is allowed to remain in force.

The present "*Instruction*" furnishes us with a judicial procedure, approximately like to that which prevails in Catholic countries, where strict ecclesiastical law obtains. The form of trial prescribed seems eminently wise and generous. To this there might seem to be two exceptions.

One of these is the fact that the "*Instruction*" makes the bishop of the accused his judge. Against this arrangement some have objected that, without impeaching even in thought the integrity of ecclesiastical superiors, and attributing only the purest motives to the framers of the law, there is, nevertheless, room for the opinion that the end of the law as stated in the preamble to the "*Instruction*," "to protect authority and avoid complaints of unjust treatment," would have been more directly and effectually attained by providing a bishop as judge, other than the bishop of the accused.

In support of this objection, it is urged that, unlike the methods of procedure in civil tribunals, the bishop of the accused is made, by the provisions of the "*Instruction*," at once prosecutor and judge and jury. The bishop is the representative of the Church; therefore, her prosecutor, and in the nature of things, it does not seem just that he should also be the arbitrator of the guilt or innocence of the accused. A just and fair trial is the right of every one charged with crime. It is not a privilege, but a right, and every judicial process should be above even the suspicion of infringing upon this right.

But, in answer to this objection, it is sufficient to say briefly that the Church does not and needs not follow after the methods of procedure in secular tribunals. The animating spirit of her discipline is purer, and its object and aim higher than that of those tribunals. Moreover, the bishop, in judicial proceedings under the "*Instruction*," does not act alone, nor unrestrictedly, nor arbitrarily. He has regularly appointed official counsellors, with whom he consults and who aid and advise him at every step of the proceedings, both in deciding the case and pronouncing sentence. Again, there is good reason to believe that another bishop, a stranger to the accused and to the diocese, would be a sterner and less considerate judge than the bishop of the diocese to which the accused belongs. And, finally, that room is left for an appeal to the Holy See in case the accused believes that his trial has been irregular, informal, or in any way unfair.

The other hypothetical objection may be still more easily answered.

This latter objection refers to the fact that to the general law,—in cases when repressive remedies are called into requisition,—a formal trial is the right of the accused. There is a notable exception, viz., the power to sentence and punish *ex informata conscientia*. This most certainly is a remarkable exception, and at first sight would lead a superficially informed person to suppose that the grand scheme of the "*Instruction*" was frustrated and that on this point it was self-contradictory. For to punish *ex informata conscientia* seems to deprive the accused of the sacred right of defence, and to punish him unheard.

But to this there is an all-sufficient answer. The law giving the power of condemning and punishing *ex informata conscientia* was first framed in the Council of Trent, and since then has obtained throughout the Church. In those days the corruption of ecclesiastics was deep and widespread, and heroic measures were required. There were crimes which, from their peculiar nature and from the circumstances connected with them, could not be brought home publicly to the perpetrators, at least, by a public trial, without doing even more harm than did their secret commission. Yet, of the commission of those crimes there was no room for doubt. To meet these cases the Church gave the seemingly astounding power to her bishops of condemning and punishing *ex informata conscientia;* and the necessity of continuing this power to them still exists.

Nor is this extraordinary power so astounding as at first sight it seems to those who are unacquainted with its reasons and limitations. Bishops are not thereby empowered to exercise this extraordinary faculty at will. There is still a *medium in rebus* even for them under this method of procedure. The crime must be well defined and certain. It must be occult. In no case, upon which testimony, either favorable or adverse, can be brought into the open light of day, is the exercise of this power permissible. Then, too, the accused has still the right of appeal to the Holy See. And we know whereof we speak when we say that our reigning Sovereign Pontiff, Leo XIII., is fully resolved to restrict the exercise of this extraordinary power within its proper and legitimate limits.

On the whole, the "*Instruction*" is eminently acceptable. It supplies a long and a deeply felt want, and is assuredly hailed with pleasure and satisfaction by the Priesthood of the American Church.

The exposition by Dr. Smith of the aim and meaning of this "*Instruction*," is timely and valuable, and it will be so received, we believe, by the clergy and bishops of the Church in the United States. We hope it will obtain a wide circulation.

INDIFFERENTISM; or, Is One Religion as Good as Another? By the *Rev. John MacLaughlin*. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.; London: Burns & Oates; Glasgow: Hugh Margey; Dublin: James Duffy & Sons. 1887.

This unpretentious and modest, but able little book is emphatically a "Tract for the Times." It deals with what is the prevalent error of our age, and the one which is now more actively powerful than any other in lulling into a false security very many amiable and well-meaning persons, who have sufficient discernment to see the irreconcilable contradictions and fallacies of Protestant creeds, but who are deluded by the shallow but specious theory that a certain knowledge of revealed truth is unattainable or unimportant, and one religious belief is as good as another, or, in other words, that all religious belief is merely a matter of personal preference and of no essential importance.

This false notion is the chief and most prolific cause of the prevailing

tendency of our times to Agnosticism and infidelity. For it is but a very short step from the notion that one creed is as good as another, and one religion as good as another, to the belief that all religions are valueless and have no claims upon the belief or the consciences of intelligent persons.

The Rev. author, in his introductory chapter, very clearly explains this and shows how this Latitudinarianism or Indifferentism has paved the way by which millions of persons in England have passed or are passing from Evangelical Protestantism to Rationalism, Agnosticism, and infidelity. And what he says of the effects of Indifferentism or Latitudinarianism in England is equally true of it in the United States and on the Continent of Europe.

And while Indifferentism is thus the enemy of the Protestant sects by sweeping immense numbers of their adherents into the ranks of unbelief, it is not less the enemy of the Catholic Church. It is this not from bitter hostility or determined opposition, for it is too tolerant, at least in its first stages, of every form of belief, to be sternly opposed to any, but it is the enemy of the Catholic Church by keeping many persons out of her fold who otherwise would enter it. For, "when a man has gone so far as to regard religion as a mere matter of opinion, and consequently as a matter of choice, he is not likely to choose a difficult one, when an easy one will suit his purpose quite as well. Naturally men are averse to having their intellect bound down to definite doctrines, and to having their will burthened by difficult obligations. There are few, if any, who will think of embracing a creed which imposes many restraints, while they feel, or at least try to feel, they can go to Heaven equally safely by one that imposes hardly any restraint at all."

In the treatment of his subject, the author first refutes the theory of Indifference on grounds of natural reason and of reason enlightened by faith. He shows that, God being what He is, the God of eternal, unchanging truth, He cannot be indifferent as to whether His intelligent creatures choose a particular creed or some other one that contradicts it. To say that He is indifferent to this is to declare by necessary implication that God cares not whether His children believe truth or falsehood.

The author then, in successive chapters, shows that the theory of Indifferentism contradicts Divine Revelation. Were that theory true, then there would be no need of Divine Revelation. Moreover, when our Divine Lord commissioned His Apostles, He enjoined them to teach all that He had commanded them. They were all, therefore, to teach the self-same truths and precepts, and this being the case, it was obligatory on those who were taught to receive and believe what the Apostles taught, and not to receive or believe, but to reject whatever was at variance with that teaching.

The author then shows, in separate chapters, that Indifferentism contradicts the history of Cornelius the Centurion, and the history of the Council of Jerusalem. He then, in Part II. of his work, makes a direct practical application of his previous arguments. He refers to the fact that many persons who believe in Divine Revelation will acknowledge the truth of what thus far he had said, viz., that all religions cannot be true, that only one of them can be true, and, therefore, that all others must be false, yet they contend that it is impossible to ascertain which of them is that one only true religion.

This error he exposes and refutes by showing that the true religion has certain notes or marks which it alone possesses and by which it can be infallibly known. Two of these notes, Unity and Universality, he points out and explains very lucidly. The other notes of the Church

he omits treating, in order to compress his matter into the smallest possible compass.

It is to be hoped that the work will be extensively read. Its plan is highly judicious, and its arguments are plain, direct and solid.

THE NEW RACCOLTA; or, Collection of Prayers and Good Works, to which the Sovereign Pontiffs have attached Holy Indulgences. Published in 1886 by order of His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII. Translation authorized and approved by the Sacred Congregation of Holy Indulgences. To which is added an Appendix, containing Prayers for Mass and Vespers for Sundays. Philadelphia: Peter F. Cunningham & Son. 1887.

The next latest edition of the *Raccolta* to this, which was, officially, published in Rome, appeared in the year 1877. Since then other documents, containing Indulgences already granted to all the faithful who recite certain prayers, or perform certain designated good works, were presented to the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences and Holy Relics. Moreover, since then our Holy Father has enriched many prayers and pious works with indulgences which may, in like manner, be gained by all the faithful. Then, too, many of the indulgences previously attached to prayers and works of piety have been extended or restricted. On these accounts, and in order that all these indulgences might be more widely known, and that thus the interests of religion might be promoted, the Sacred Congregation thought it opportune to publish a new edition of the *Raccolta*, adding therein those prayers and pious works which, owing to the causes above mentioned, were not contained in the edition of 1878. This collection, therefore, which the Sacred Congregation of Holy Indulgences authorizes, has superseded all previous ones. Our Holy Father, Leo XIII., in virtue of his Apostolic authority, has approved and ordered this to be used by all persons as the genuine and authentic collection of all the indulgences hitherto granted. Hence, also, His Holiness has decreed that this same collection is to be taken as a rule in the settling of doubts which may arise as to the sense of the concession or as to the conditions requisite for gaining the indulgences.

The translation before us of this latest edition of the *Raccolta* was duly examined by two professors of theology of Woodstock College, who testified that they found it to be entirely faithful and in full accord with the Italian original. It was then submitted to the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences and Holy Relics, and by them it was approved as authentic and permitted to be published. It also has the *Imprimatur* of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons and of His Grace the Most Rev. Archbishop of Philadelphia.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIÆ MORALIS, a Joanne Gury, S.J., Primo Exoratum et deinde ab Antonio Ballerini, ejusdem Societatis, Adnotationibus Auctum, nunc vero ad Breviorem Formam Redactum, atque ad Usum Seminariorum hujus Regionis Accomodatum ab Aloysio Sabetti, S.J., in Collegio Woodstockiensi, S.J., Theologiæ Moralis Professore. Editio Altera. Ab Auctoritate Recognita ad Norman Conc. Plen. Balt. III., atque Recentiorum Cong. Rom. Decretorum. Neo-Eboraci et Cincinnati; Frid. Pustet et Soc., S. Sedis Apost. et S. Rituum Cong. Typogr., 1887.

Father Sabetti, in the volume before us, has given the clergy and theological students a most excellent and valuable book. Taking Gury for a basis, he has reproduced all that is worth preserving, and has retrenched all his references to French law and European usages, which are quite unnecessary for our students. In its place he has substituted from the Baltimore Councils and other sources what is most useful and necessary for American priests and students to know. So, too, he has

done with Ballerini's notes. They are excellent, like everything else that came from the pen of that learned and holy man. But they are too copious and prolix for a student's manual, and, we may add, too controversial, the controversy assuming occasionally a personal character. Father Sabetti has shown his judgment by incorporating in his text all that was new and valuable in Ballerini's notes. Yet it were a pity that the notes should be lost or forgotten. And it is to be hoped that, if ever Ballerini's long-promised volume of Moral Theology should be gathered up and printed from his posthumous papers, these notes will be preserved in the Appendix, for they are too long to be printed at the foot of the page. F. Sabetti's book is well adapted for all our seminaries, for it is neither prolix nor jejune, and where the course of Moral Theology is longer, his brief pointed statements can be enlarged and filled out by the living voice of the professor. That the book (first printed in 1884) has so soon reached a second edition, is proof of its popularity with priests and professors.

CANONICAL PROCEDURE in Disciplinary and Criminal Cases of Clerics. A systematic commentary on the "Instructio S. C. Epp. et Regg. 1880." By the *Rev. Francis Droste.* Edited by the Rev. Sebastian G. Messmer, D.D. New York: Benziger Bros. 1887. 8vo. Pp. 268.

It is a pity that any necessity for ecclesiastical trials should exist. But as long as human nature remains what it now is, they will be needed. The only thing left to be done is to conduct them properly, so that innocent parties may not be aggrieved, and that justice and equity may remain intact, even in the case of the guilty. The provisions of the Church in this portion of her jurisprudence are admirable for their wisdom, and when fully carried out leave no possible ground for complaint.

The work of Droste is what its title calls it, a commentary on one of the latest and most important enactments on this head, and will be of great use to any Canonist or student of Canon Law. The work, written originally in German, was translated by a priest of Covington, Ky.; but the present edition by Dr. Messmer may be looked on in the light of a new translation. He has infused into the work the *lucidus ordo* which was wanting in the original, but has also enriched it with many additions, which render it more suitable to the wants of our country. He has done a good work, for which students should feel deeply grateful. The style is clear, and even non-professional readers may find it to their advantage to consult the work.

CLARE VAUGHAN. By *Lady Lovat.* New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

This is not a novel, as its title might lead some to suppose. Yet it is "as interesting as a novel." Nay, far more so. It is a true story. And as truth is often more wonderful than fiction, so, too, it is, as it ought to be, more interesting.

Clare Vaughan is not the name of a fictitious person, nor of one who lived long ages ago, but of a girl of our own times, the child of highly respectable English parents, in comfortable circumstances. She was well educated, gentle, refined, intellectually gifted, graceful, beautiful, amiable in every respect; a girl of exquisite sensibility, of ardent affections, and of firm resolve.

She fixed her affections upon One who was most worthy of her love.

To Him she clung, for Him she lived, and for Him she died. He was no earthly lover, but our Blessed Redeemer and Divine Lord.

The story of this beautiful life is simply and beautifully told, and will be read both with interest and profit by all who can discern what is above all things else truly beautiful and lovely.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST. The Sacrifice, the Sacrament, and the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ. Practice of Love of Jesus Christ. Novena in honor of the Holy Ghost. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Bros. 1887.

This is the sixth voume of the new and complete edition in English of the works of St. Alphonsus de Liguori, published by Messrs. Benziger Brothers, and called "The Centenary Edition." It comprises a number of independent treatises of St. Alphonsus, but all relating to the same general subject. The chief of these are The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, Visits to the Blessed Sacrament and to the Blessed Virgin, Meditations for the Octave of Corpus Christi, Novena to the Sacred Heart, The Practice of the Love of Jesus Christ, Novena to the Holy Ghost. Appropriate meditations and prayers and hymns are generally appended to these different treatises.

FIORDALISA: A Quaint Italian Tale. By *Anton Giulio Barrili*. Baltimore: The Baltimore Publishing Co.

This story goes back to the fourteenth century and the times of Giotto and Taddeo Gaddi, founders of the Florentine school of painting. Its chief personages are mainly artists and their disciples. It introduces the reader into their studios and makes him intimately acquainted with their ruling ideas of art, their friendships and their jealousies, their likes and their dislikes. Incidentally, too, it portrays the habits, customs, and peculiarities of Italian life in those times. It is a story of intense passion, of deep unchanging faith, unrelenting hatred and tragic vengeance.

OUR DIVINE SAVIOUR AND OTHER DISCOURSES. By the *Right Rev. J. C. Hedley, O.S.B.*, Bishop of Newport and Menevia. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co.

This volume is made up of eighteen sermons, which chiefly treat of the Incarnation and kindred subjects. They are not controversial in form, yet they have constant reference to current errors of our day. They are brief, concise, lucid; profoundly philosophical, yet so direct and simple, in the arrangement of their thoughts and in their language that any person of ordinary intelligence can understand and profit by them.

ONCE UPON A TIME: A Collection of Stories. Reprinted from the "Ave Maria." Office of "Ave Maria," Notre Dame, Ind.

The volume before us contains a dozen or more short stories that were originally published in the *Ave Maria* and are now republished in book-form. They are admirably written and, though intended especially for children, will be read with pleasure and also with profit by older persons.

PERIODICAL 70745

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM